

century by the distinguished junior Senator from New York. He deserves the richest praise from the people not only of New York but also of the Nation.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Illinois very much indeed.

#### RECESS TO 11 A. M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 15, 1956, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 14 (legislative day May 7), 1956:

##### FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Sam H. Bober, of South Dakota, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for the term expiring March 31, 1962.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 14, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Harold B. Sedgwick, St. Thomas' Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God whom to forget is to stumble and whom to remember is to rise again, set Thy seal, we beseech Thee, upon every work which we do in Thy name, that we may not begin an action without a pure intention—we may not continue it without Thy blessing.

Give to each of us a passionate desire to see the truth, courage to say yes when it would be easier to say no, and no when it would be easier to say yes. May we never be content with anything less than the best, for Thou hast entrusted into our hands great responsibilities and infinite powers.

Deliver us from pettiness when human life is at stake. Teach us when to speak and when to be silent, when to rise up and when to sit down—so by the manner of our life may be judged the stature of our soul. Finally, O God, grant that we may so quit ourselves this day that when evening comes, we may be deserving of rest and quietness that only Thou canst give, at peace with ourselves and with our own consciences. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 10, 1956, was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3732. An act to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 56-13.

#### AMENDING THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1939

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6143) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that for taxable years beginning after May 31, 1950, certain amounts received in consideration of the transfer of patent rights shall be considered capital gain regardless of the basis upon which such amounts are paid, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. COOPER, MILLS, GREGORY, REED of New York, and JENKINS.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Pursuant to authority granted on May 10, Mr. CANNON on May 11 submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 10004) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

#### REV. HAROLD BEND SEDGWICK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Harold Bend Sedgwick, who has just given the opening prayer, has the distinction of being the great-great-grandson of a former Speaker of this body. Dr. Sedgwick's distinguished ancestor was Theodore Sedgwick, a Representative from the great State of Massachusetts. He was the Speaker of the House during the sixth session of the Congress and was the first Speaker to preside over the House when this body first met in the city of Washington.

Speaker Sedgwick presided over this body on November 18, 1800, when the Congress first met in Washington. The quarters in which the House met and over which Speaker Sedgwick presided, were the rooms now occupied by the Senate Disbursing Office in the original north wing of the Capitol, now known as the Supreme Court section of the Capitol.

Theodore Sedgwick served as a delegate, as a Representative, and also as a

Senator from the State of Massachusetts. He was a member of the Continental Congress and was also a delegate to the State convention that adopted the Federal Constitution in 1788. Among his many distinguished public services were his service as President pro tempore of the United States Senate in 1798.

The great-great-grandson of this eminent son of Massachusetts, Dr. Sedgwick, who served as our chaplain today, is rector of St. Thomas' Church in Washington, D. C. We are glad to welcome him to this House, once so ably presided over by his fine ancestor.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to associate myself as an individual Member of the House, and speaking for the Democratic Members, with the remarks made by my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], in relation to Dr. Sedgwick. We are very happy to have Dr. Sedgwick with us to offer prayer on the occasion of the meeting of the House today. I know it must bring to Dr. Sedgwick a great feeling of happiness to know that he offered prayer in the very body over which his great-great-grandfather presided with such dignity, strength, and effectiveness.

For my colleagues I join my dear friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] in the very appropriate remarks that he made on the occasion of Dr. Sedgwick offering prayer in the House today.

#### EDWIN K. STANTON

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2057, an act for the relief of Edwin K. Stanton, together with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GRAPHIC ARTS CORPORATION OF OHIO

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2893, an act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Graphic Arts Corporation of Ohio, of Toledo, Ohio, together with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, de-

termine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Graphic Arts Corporation of Ohio, Toledo, Ohio, as to the liability of the United States, if any, either legal or equitable, for losses alleged to have been sustained by the said Graphic Arts Corporation of Ohio as the result of the performance of a contract, Numbered W33-038ac 2023, dated April 17, 1944, entered into with the United States Army Air Corps.

"Sec. 2. Notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time, suit upon such claim may be instituted by the claimant within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. Proceedings for the determination of such claim and review thereof, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be had as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code.

"Sec. 3. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

S. H. PRATHER, MRS. FLORENCE PRATHER PENMAN, AND S. H. PRATHER, JR.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 5535, an act for the relief of S. H. Prather, Mrs. Florence Prather Penman, and S. H. Prather, Jr., together with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 21, after "skull" insert "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. MICHAEL CULLEN

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7164) for the relief of Lt. Michael Cullen, together with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 11, after "veterans" insert "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of

this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may have permission to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 11040) to advance the scientific and professional research and development programs of the Departments of Defense, the Interior, and Commerce, to improve the management and administration of certain department activities, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THIS WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the Members of the House at this time that the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill will come up for consideration on Wednesday next. I also desire to alert Members on both sides that, as far as I know at the present time, there is liable to be a floor fight on this matter, so that the Members may govern themselves accordingly.

I also desire to announce that on Thursday next His Excellency, Dr. Soekarno, President of the Republic of Indonesia, who will be in the United States at that time on an official visit, will address a joint meeting of the Congress. That is Thursday, May 17, at 12:30 p. m. We hope that as many Members as possible will be present.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I rise to inquire about the conference report on the sugar bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, the gentleman from Massachusetts went as far as he possibly could the other day, and there is nothing further that he can add, and there is no further assist he can give at this time.

#### SEVER DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, recent events involving Communist Russia call for a study of the intent and purpose of that Government. The American people are entitled to know if the Russian Embassy and other satellite embassies are espionage centers. The record, Mr. Speaker, would seem to indicate that Russia is an international outlaw. Her actions to date confirm that statement. Has not the time come when we should consider ending our relations with men who control a government we cannot trust? As we look about the world today we know that wherever there is trouble it is being agitated systematically by world-wrecking Communists. There can be no peace, no hope for peace, so long as godless communism has a seat in the family of nations and is accorded the dignity of diplomatic, cultural and economic recognition.

Mr. Speaker, toward that end I have today introduced a House concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee composed of 5 Members of the Senate and 5 Members of the House of Representatives. The purpose of this committee will be to conduct a full and complete study and inquiry with respect to all aspects of the question of severance of diplomatic, economic, cultural and all other relations between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Mr. Speaker, it did not take the Australian Government very long to close the Russian Embassy in Australia when it was discovered it was serving as an espionage center with the sole purpose of destroying the Australian Government. Can we afford to do less in view of events that have transpired in the past 5 years, not only here but throughout the world?

Mr. Speaker, the diplomatic history of the Soviet is a long and sordid one. Since 1917 Moscow has renounced more than 1,000 treaties, the latest being flagrant Communist violation of the Korean armistice. Evidence continues to accumulate that the longer we try to do business with Communists the deeper we are in the hole. Moscow's idea of diplomacy is subversion, and I repeat that her embassies and those of her satellites are espionage centers.

Her diplomatic missions are not channels for peaceful international relations but are merely new avenues of intrigue.

Mr. Speaker, the record is clear, you cannot do business with Communists.



Faith, trust and confidence are the very foundations of international relationships. Russia lacks all of these virtues.

#### TENNESSEE AND THE RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Tennessee has deep interest in the rural development program. Examination of House Document No. 149, Development of Agriculture's Human Resources, shows Tennessee as having both substantial and serious low income and level of living areas in agriculture. Plans to improve these conditions should be encouraged.

Resulting from the interest of President Eisenhower, and the studies by the Department of Agriculture which culminated in the President's message to Congress on April 26, 1955, a meeting was held at Memphis, Tenn., in June 1955. At this time broad general plans were discussed on the national level for the rural development program.

In August, a Tennessee State meeting on the same subject was held in Nashville. Following this, three pilot counties were selected for intensive study and work to see what could be done through coordinated, concentrated effort. These three counties are Grainger, Macon, and Hardin. They are representative of different areas and conditions within the State.

Not only a State committee but an active county committee in each of these countries has been at work. Studies, plans, and programs have been developed. There is enthusiasm.

Hardin County says:

It is . . . believed that through coordinated effort of all local groups and organizations using all available local resources along with States and Federal assistance, that outstanding progress can be made in raising the economic, social, educational, recreational, and religious level of the low-income group of people. . . .

It is difficult to foresee, at this time, all the help needed to initiate and activate the work on specific problems identified in this plan as immediate approaches to the expansion and progress of the rural development program. However, it is recognized that consultant service and technical assistance in conducting research projects and surveys, additional full-time personnel, and extra funds will be needed for the immediate growth of this program.

Technical assistance is needed from the State and national level to: Assist in research or factfinding studies; supply authentic information, both verbal and written; provide advisory and counseling services in all phases of this program.

Some additional full-time personnel is needed at the local level, including: . . . a trained person to coordinate the rural development program; a veterinarian; and a forester.

Additional funds will be needed to: . . . employ additional personnel; meet other expenses necessary to the development of the program.

Among the possible solutions listed by Macon County, are:

More liberal low interest credit needs to be offered these low-income farmers. To be specific we need a full-time Farmers Home Administration supervisor in Macon County to make loans for fencing, seeding, fertilizer, and establishing foundation herds of livestock.

The Soil Conservation Service district needs additional help for laying out contours in strawberry fields, digging additional livestock ponds, and general conservation practices on all farms.

Add special agents to the present extension staff to carry out educational aspects of this program and do farm and home planning on these low-income farms in particular.

Grainger County includes among items of immediate help needed:

Increased ASC funds for conservation practices. . . .

Additional technically trained extension personnel. . . . More space is needed for materials, records, posters, demonstrations, office visits, and workshops.

More adequate research information, census data, conservation needs, group desires, interests, farm potentials.

A plan of action for reforestation and fire protection in the county, for watershed control of farms, communities, and the county.

Credit loans for buildings, equipment, and farm-home needs. . . .

Specialists' help in overall program.

In its budget requests for fiscal year 1957, the Department of Agriculture provided reasonable minimum sums for initiating the type of work outlined above in some pilot counties throughout the areas of need within the United States. The report of the Appropriations Committee recommends severe cuts in these sums. The needs are so great and the requests are so reasonable that I feel we should restore to the budget the full amounts for these purposes requested by the Department of Agriculture.

#### WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION LAW FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, this is District Day. At a meeting of the Committee on the District of Columbia, 2 or 3 weeks ago, we reported out a number of bills. Among them was H. R. 3015 which has for its purpose enacting a workmen's compensation law for the District of Columbia. I notice the bill is not listed for consideration today although the committee took definite action to the effect that it should be brought up on District Day.

My inquiry is, how do we bring up a bill in conformance with the wishes of the committee, that committee having voted out the bill to be considered on District day?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the chairman of the committee has not consulted with the present occupant of the Chair on the matter of bringing up that bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the bill was reported out by the full Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. That does not automatically put it on the program.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is on the Union Calendar now, having been reported May 7. Does it require a rule to take it off the Union Calendar, or may any member of the Committee on the District of Columbia bring the bill up for consideration?

The SPEAKER. If the committee directs and authorizes some Member to bring it up, he may do so. The Chair will recognize him for that purpose.

#### PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order to consider the public works appropriation bill for 1957 on May 22 without regard to the fact that it will be reported on May 21.

Mr. MARTIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is that agreeable to the minority members of the committee?

Mr. RABAUT. I may say that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Davis] cannot be here on the day it was scheduled for before.

Mr. MARTIN. This is agreeable to him?

Mr. RABAUT. It is agreeable to him.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### ATOMIC SCIENTIST WARNS UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AGAINST DRAGGING ITS FEET ON PEACE-TIME AND INDUSTRIAL USE OF ATOMIC ENERGY—UNITED STATES BEHIND BRITAIN AND U. S. S. R. IN THIS VITAL FIELD

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on April 19, 1956, Dr. Alvin M. Weinberg, a noted authority on atomic energy pointed out some appalling facts before the Atomic Energy Industrial Forum, at Oak Ridge, Tenn.

Certainly the development of atomic energy for peaceful and industrial use is a subject which demands immediate and forthright action by this Government. Dr. Weinberg pointed out that the British Government and the Government of the Soviet Union are already spending a billion dollars each for the development of industrial uses of atomic energy. The United States Government has turned this tremendous task over to private industry and in his remarks Dr. Weinberg indicated that certainly our Government is dragging its feet in the development of this great potential.

I am placing in the Appendix of the daily Record the full text of Dr. Wein-

berg's statement at Oak Ridge and I hope that the Members of this body will study his remarks and give serious consideration to the emergency need now existing on the part of the United States Government in the development of atomic energy for peaceful and industrial uses.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

#### APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], I call up the bill (H. R. 6782) to amend section 7 of "An act making appropriations to provide for the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That paragraph No. 39 of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended (sec. 47-2339, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended to read as follows:

"PAR. 9. (a) The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and empowered to classify dealers in secondhand personal property (referred to in this paragraph 39 as 'dealers') and to fix and collect a license fee for each such class of dealer, which fee, in the judgment of the Commissioners, will be commensurate with the cost to the District of Columbia of inspection, supervision, and regulation of such class of dealer.

"(b) In classifying dealers the Commissioners may take into consideration the kind of property dealt in, whether the property is retained by the dealer for sale at retail, whether the property is disposed of by the dealer out of the District of Columbia, whether the property is disposed of by the dealer as junk or otherwise, and such other criteria as the Commissioners may deem appropriate.

"(c) Any person engaging in the business of buying, selling, trading, exchanging, or dealing in secondhand personal property of any description, including the return of unused portion of any ticket, order, or token purporting to evidence the right of the holder or possessor thereof to be transported by any railroad or other common carrier, however operated, from one State or Territory of the United States, or from the District of Columbia, to any other State or Territory of the United States or to the District of Columbia, shall be regarded as a dealer, and shall obtain the appropriate license and pay the fee therefor fixed by the Commissioners. For the purposes of this paragraph 39, the term 'secondhand personal property' shall not include any item of personal property (1) received as part payment or allowance on the sale of a new or rebuilt item of personal property, (2) returned by the pur-

chaser of a new or rebuilt item of personal property for credit, refund, or exchange, or (3) which has been repossessed.

"(d) When any property has been stolen and sold in the District of Columbia to a dealer under such circumstances that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, after such dealer has been afforded a hearing, are satisfied that such dealer had cause to believe, or could have ascertained by reasonable inquiry or investigation that the property was stolen, and that the dealer did not make reasonable inquiry or investigation as to the title of the seller before making the purchase, the Commissioners are authorized and directed to revoke the license of such dealer; and this action shall not be a bar to criminal prosecution for receiving stolen goods: *Provided*, That nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed as prohibiting the Commissioners from suspending or revoking the license of such dealer under the authority contained in paragraph No. 46 of this section."

SEC. 2. Paragraph 46 of section 7 of such act is amended (a) by inserting the designation "(a)" immediately before the first sentence of said paragraph 46; and (b) by adding thereto a subparagraph "(b)" reading as follows:

"(b) Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this section requiring an inspection as a prerequisite to the issuance of a license, the Commissioners are authorized to provide by regulation that any such inspection shall be made either prior or subsequent to the issuance of a license, but any such license, whether issued prior or subsequent to a required inspection, may be suspended or revoked for failure of the licensee to comply with the laws or regulations applicable to the licensed business, trade, profession, or calling."

SEC. 3. The first section of this act shall take effect on November 1 next year after the approval of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, strike out lines 3 to 7, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "item of personal property (1) which the possessor thereof has acquired as part payment or allowance on the sale by such possessor of a new or rebuilt item of personal property, (2) which the possessor thereof has acquired by reason of its return to him for credit, refund, or exchange by a person having purchased such item from such possessor, or (3) which is offered for sale, trade, or exchange by the person who repossesses the same."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, paragraph 39 of section 7 of the act of July 1, 1902, provides that dealers in secondhand personal property shall be licensed and further provides that every person engaged in the business of buying, selling, trading, exchanging, or dealing in secondhand personal property of any description shall be regarded as a secondhand dealer.

The scope of this provision of the License Act of the District of Columbia is such as to require the licensing, as a secondhand dealer, of every person dealing in used personal property, regardless of whether the sole or primary business

of such person is the buying, selling, or exchanging of used personal property, or whether his dealing in used property is only incidental to his buying and selling of new personal property, or to his dealing in used personal property as a result of his repossession of new merchandise sold by him, or whether he acquires the used property as part payment for new merchandise.

Existing law also requires that every person licensed as a secondhand dealer pay an annual license fee of \$50, without regard to the extent to which such person deals in used personal property. For example, the operator of a small gasoline station taking in a few used tires and batteries as part payment on new tires and batteries is required to pay the same annual fee as any other person dealing in any and all classes of used personal property.

Certain provisions of the License Act require that certain inspections be made before a license can be issued. Thus an accumulation of license applications creates a backlog for certain kinds of licenses.

In order to allow a better and more equitable administration and application of the License Act provision relating to the licensing of second-hand dealers, and to expedite the issuance of license for certain business, trades, professions, or callings for which prelicensing inspections are now required, the Commissioners have recommended legislation which would accomplish the following:

First. Amend existing law so as to authorize the Commissioners to classify dealers in secondhand personal property and to fix the license fee for each such class of dealer.

Second. Amend existing law so as to authorize the Commissioners, by regulation, to provide for making inspections required under the act either before or after the issuance of a license, as the best interests of the District may indicate.

This proposed legislation would accomplish the following:

First. Authorizes and empowers the Commissioners to classify dealers in secondhand personal property and to fix the fee to be charged for the licenses to be issued the dealers coming within each such class at an amount commensurate with the cost to the District of inspecting, supervising and regulating each class of dealer.

Second. Establishes a number of standards to be observed by the Commissioners in connection with the classifying of dealers in secondhand property.

Third. Excludes from the category of used personal property new property which has been repossessed, used property traded in on new or rebuilt property, and new or rebuilt property returned by a purchaser for credit, refund, or exchange. This provision will relieve from compliance with the requirement that they be licensed as dealers a large number of merchants who deal principally in new or rebuilt merchandise and take in used property only as an incident to the sale of such new or rebuilt merchandise.

Fourth. The bill also provides that the Commissioners may by regulation require



either prelicensing or postlicensing inspections so as to prevent a log jam of license applications.

This legislation has the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### APPLICATION OF UNIFORM SIMULTANEOUS DEATH ACT IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 7804) to provide that the Uniform Simultaneous Death Act shall apply in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That this act, providing for the disposition of property where there is no sufficient evidence that persons have died otherwise than simultaneously and to make uniform the law with reference thereto, shall be in effect in the District of Columbia on and after the date of the enactment of this act.

##### NO SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE OF SURVIVORSHIP

SEC. 2. Where the title to property or the devolution thereof depends upon priority of death and there is no sufficient evidence that the persons have died otherwise than simultaneously, the property of each person shall be disposed of as if he had survived, except as provided otherwise in this act.

##### SURVIVAL OF BENEFICIARIES

SEC. 3. If property is so disposed of that the right of a beneficiary to succeed to any interest therein is conditional upon his surviving another person, and both persons die, and there is no sufficient evidence that the two have died otherwise than simultaneously, the beneficiary shall be deemed not to have survived. If there is no sufficient evidence that two or more beneficiaries have died otherwise than simultaneously and property has been disposed of in such a way that at the time of their death each of such beneficiaries would have been entitled to the property if he had survived the others, the property shall be divided into as many equal portions as there were such beneficiaries and these portions shall be distributed respectively to those who would have taken in the event that each of such beneficiaries had survived.

##### JOINT TENANTS OR TENANTS BY THE ENTIRETY

SEC. 4. Where there is no sufficient evidence that two joint tenants or tenants by the entirety have died otherwise than simultaneously the property so held shall be distributed, or descend as the case may be, one-half as if one had survived and one-half as if the other had survived. If there are more than two joint tenants and all of them have so died the property thus distributed or descended shall be in the proportion that one bears to the whole number of joint tenants.

The term "joint tenants" includes owners of property held under circumstances which entitled one or more to the whole of the property on the death of the other or others.

##### INSURANCE POLICIES

SEC. 5. Where the insured and the beneficiary in a policy of life or accident insurance have died and there is no sufficient evidence that they have died otherwise than simultaneously, the proceeds of the policy shall be distributed as if the insured had survived the beneficiary.

##### ACT DOES NOT APPLY IF DECEDENT PROVIDES OTHERWISE

SEC. 6. This act shall not apply in the case of wills, living trusts, deeds, or contracts of insurance, or any other situation where provision is made for distribution of property different from the provisions of this act, or where provision is made for a presumption as to survivorship which results in a distribution of property different from that here provided.

##### UNIFORMITY OF INTERPRETATION

SEC. 7. This act shall be so construed and interpreted as to effectuate its general purpose to make uniform the law in those States which enact it.

##### SHORT TITLE

SEC. 8. This act may be cited as the Uniform Simultaneous Death Act.

##### REPEAL

SEC. 9. All laws or parts of laws inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

##### SEVERABILITY

SEC. 10. If any of the provisions of this act or the application thereof to any persons or circumstances is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of the act which can be given effect without the invalid provisions or application, and to this end the provisions of this act are declared to be severable.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 22, insert the following:

"ACT NOT RETROACTIVE

"SEC. 7. This act shall not apply to the distribution of the property of a person who has died before it takes effect."

Page 4, line 2, strike out "7" and insert "8."

Line 6, strike out "8" and insert "9."

Line 9, strike out "9" and insert "10."

Line 12, strike out "10" and insert "11."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is to make the Uniform Simultaneous Death Act, as amended, apply in the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia is without any orderly plan of distribution of estates in case of simultaneous death. The District of Columbia and the other courts of the Federal jurisdiction utilize the common-law rule when confronted with the problem of survivorship in common disaster cases.

The Federal courts, including the District of Columbia, in applying the common-law rule, encounter enumerable problems of proof, and the result of discarding presumptions and exacting evidence is to put the burden of proving survivorship on any party claiming to

derive title to property from a deceased person whose ownership during life depended upon his outliving some other person who was deceased. The result is that if the party on whom the burden of proof rests cannot make his proof, his case fails.

The common-law rule is stated in Wigmore on Evidence in the following words:

Where two or more persons have perished in the same disaster, there is at common law no presumption of law that either survived the other, or that all perished at the same time. The burden of proving that one survived another will commonly be on any claimant for whom the fact is essential to his own chain of title (3 Ed. 2532).

The Supreme Court has said in the case of *Young Women's Christian Home v. French* (187 U. S. 401, 23 S. Ct. 184, 186, 47 Ed. 233), as follows:

The rule is that there is no presumption of survivorship in the case of persons who perish by a common disaster, in the absence of proof tending to show the order of dissolution, and that circumstances surrounding the calamity of the character appearing on this record are insufficient to create any presumption on which the courts can act. The question of actual survivorship is regarded as unascertainable, and descent and distribution take the same course as if the deaths had been simultaneous.

The result of the common law rule has been the burden of proof which resulted from it. Whoever had the burden of proving survivorship was faced with an impossible situation, since, by the very nature of the problem, survivorship could not be ascertained.

In order to provide a solution to the problem of death in common disaster, resort has been to statutory enactment. The pending bill is the Uniform Simultaneous Death Act, as amended, prepared some years ago by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and amended by it.

Forty-one States have enacted the Uniform Simultaneous Death Act, including the neighboring States of Maryland and Virginia. This act provides that where title to property or devolution thereof depends upon priority of death and there is no sufficient evidence that the persons have died otherwise than simultaneously, the property of each person shall be disposed of as if he had survived, except as provided otherwise in the act. It further provides that if property is so disposed of that the right of a beneficiary to succeed to any interest therein is conditioned upon his surviving another person, and both persons die and there is no sufficient evidence that the two have died otherwise than simultaneously, the beneficiary shall be deemed not to have survived. And if there is no sufficient evidence that two or more beneficiaries have died otherwise than simultaneously and property has been disposed of in such a way that at the time of their death each of such beneficiaries would have been entitled to the property if he had survived the others, the property shall be divided into as many equal portions as there were such beneficiaries and these portions shall be distributed respectively to those

who would have taken in the event that each of such beneficiaries had survived. The second sentence of section 3 constitutes an amendment of the original act adopted by the Commission on Uniform State Laws.

The bill further provides that where there is no sufficient evidence that two joint tenants or tenants by the entirety have died otherwise than simultaneously, the property so held shall be distributed, or descent as the case may be, one-half as if one had survived and one-half as if the other had survived; and that if there were more than two joint tenants and all of them have so died, the property thus distributed or descended shall be the proportion that one bears to the whole number of joint tenants.

The bill further provides that when the insured and the beneficiary in a policy of life or accident insurance have died and there is no sufficient evidence that they have died other than simultaneously, the proceeds of the policy shall be distributed as if the insured had survived the beneficiary.

The act shall not apply in the case of wills, living trusts, deeds, or contracts of insurance, or any other situation where provision is made for distribution of property different from the provisions of the act, or where provision is made for a presumption as to survivorship which results in a distribution of property different from that provided in the act.

The Judiciary Subcommittee of the House District Committee held a public hearing on this legislation on April 11, 1956, at which time no one appeared in opposition thereto. The bill has the approval of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia as well as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RETIREMENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 10768) to amend section 5 of the act of August 7, 1946, entitled "An act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia," as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 5 of the act of August 7, 1946, entitled "An Act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia," as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(C) (1) The annuity of any person who now or hereafter is receiving or entitled to receive an annuity from the teachers' retirement and annuity fund shall be increased,

effective on October 1, 1955, or on the commencing date of the annuity, whichever is

later, in accordance with the following schedule:

If annuity commences between—	Annuity not in excess of \$1,500 shall be increased by—	Annuity in excess of \$1,500 shall be increased by—
August 20, 1920, and June 30, 1955.	12 per centum.	8 per centum.
July 1, 1955, and December 31, 1955.	10 per centum.	7 per centum.
January 1, 1956, and June 30, 1956.	8 per centum.	6 per centum.
July 1, 1956, and December 31, 1956.	6 per centum.	4 per centum.
January 1, 1957, and June 30, 1957.	4 per centum.	2 per centum.
July 1, 1957, and December 31, 1957.	2 per centum.	1 per centum.

"Such increase in annuity shall not exceed the sum necessary to increase such annuity, exclusive of annuity purchased by voluntary contributions under this act, to \$4,104. The monthly installment of each annuity so increased shall be fixed at the nearest dollar.

"(2) The increases provided by this subsection, when added to the annuities of retired employees, shall not operate to increase the annuities of their survivors, except that the annuity of any such survivor who becomes entitled to annuity shall be increased by the percent provided in subsection (C) (1) of this section appropriate to the commencing date of such survivor's annuity."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike "(C)" and insert "(c)."  
Page 2, line 14, strike "(C)" and insert "(c)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ABERNETHY: Add a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 2. Any person entitled to annuity pursuant to the provisions of the act approved January 15, 1920 (41 Stat. 387), as amended, or the act approved August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 875), as amended, may decline to accept all or any part of such annuity by a waiver signed and filed with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent. Such waiver may be revoked in writing at any time, but no payment of the annuity waived shall be made covering the period during which such waiver was in effect."

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, this bill would increase annuities of retired teachers and school officers and of annuitants under the act of August 7, 1946. The amount of the increase is set forth on a percentage basis and would depend upon the commencing date of the annuity, as shown in the following schedule:

If annuity commences between—	Annuity not in excess of \$1,500 shall be increased by—	Annuity in excess of \$1,500 shall be increased by—
August 20, 1920, and June 30, 1955.	12 per centum.	8 per centum.
July 1, 1955, and December 31, 1955.	10 per centum.	7 per centum.
January 1, 1956, and June 30, 1956.	8 per centum.	6 per centum.
July 1, 1956, and December 31, 1956.	6 per centum.	4 per centum.
January 1, 1957, and June 30, 1957.	4 per centum.	2 per centum.
July 1, 1957, and December 31, 1957.	2 per centum.	1 per centum.

The increase, which would be permanent, would not exceed the sum necessary to increase regular annuities—excluding annuity purchased by voluntary contributions—to \$4,104. The bill includes language limiting the increase in annuity provided by the bill to \$4,104. This language is identical to that which is contained in Public Law 369, 84th Congress, which applies to persons retired under the Federal Civil Service Retirement Act. Public Law 369 became effective October 1, 1955. The provision limiting increases in annuities to \$4,104 has been construed by the Civil Service Commission as not adversely affecting any annuitant already retired or to be retired in the future under the Civil Service Retirement Act. It is the intent of the committee that this bill will have the same effect. It was the intent of this committee, at the time this legislation was considered, that no teacher under the District of Columbia school system would suffer adversely under this legislation. This would include past, present and future teachers in the school system.

The present value of the increased disbursement resulting from enactment

of the bill is estimated at \$2,619,100. The first year cost would be approximately \$252,800.

This bill gives to retired teachers and school officers and to surviving annuitants of teachers and school officers the same percentage increases as was given to retired personnel and surviving annuitants under the Federal Civil Service Retirement Act by Public Law 369, 84th Congress.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have reported that they favor the increases in annuities which would be effected by this bill.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see this bill being acted on. I introduced a companion bill to it with only slight differences.

I recommend for the future consideration of the House that when annuity bills are being considered for civil-service employees the teachers of the District of Columbia be considered at the same time and not have to wait in the



future for another year or maybe several years, which has happened sometimes in the past, before they are given the same annuity benefits that are given other regular civil-service employees.

I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for yielding to me.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIRE DEPARTMENT AREA OF RESIDENCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, following the presentation of the bill by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Recreation, I now yield to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Police, Firemen, Streets, and Traffic, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 2603) to increase the area within which officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and Fire Department of the District of Columbia may reside, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That there shall be no limitation or restriction of place of residence of any officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, or of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia other than residence within the Washington, D. C., metropolitan district. For the purposes of this act, "Washington, D. C., metropolitan district" shall be held to include the District of Columbia and the territory adjacent thereto within a radius of 20 miles from the United States Capitol Building. Any officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia living outside of the District of Columbia shall have and maintain a telephone at all times in his residence.

Sec. 2. No member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall, unless on leave of absence, go beyond the confines of the District of Columbia, or be absent from duty without permission. Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the right of officers and members of the Fire Department to reside anywhere within the Washington, D. C., metropolitan district. Leaves of absence exceeding 20 days in any 1 year shall be without pay and shall require the consent of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Thirty days shall be the term of total sick leave in any 1 year without disallowance of pay. Leave of absence with pay of members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia may be extended in cases of illness or injury incurred in line of duty, upon recommendation of the board of surgeons approved by the Commissioners, for such period exceeding 30 days in any 1 year as in the judgment of the Commissioners may be necessary. For the purposes of this subsection "any one year" shall mean a year

from January 1 to December 31, both dates inclusive.

Sec. 3. The following laws or parts of laws are hereby repealed:

(1) Section 373 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia (D. C. Code, sec. 4-132).

(2) The act entitled "An act to amend section 483 of title 20 of the Code of the District of Columbia as to residence of members of the Police Department," approved August 9, 1935 (D. C. Code, sec. 4-132).

(3) The second paragraph under the heading "Fire Department" of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1913, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 4-409).

(4) The act entitled "An act to amend section 559 of title 20 of the Code of the District of Columbia as to restriction on residence of members of the fire department," approved August 9, 1935 (D. C. Code, sec. 4-409).

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, lines 13 through 16, strike out the following: "Leaves of absence exceeding 20 days in any one year shall be without pay and shall require the consent of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to increase the area within which officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia may reside.

Under existing law police and firemen may only reside within a 12-mile radius. This proposed legislation would permit them to reside within a 20-mile radius.

It is felt that if this bill is enacted into law police and firemen will be able to secure better housing at a more reasonable rate. Since there appears to be a trend among the younger men in the Departments to have large families the enactment of this bill would mean that they would be able to secure better housing with more land at a more reasonable price—thus having a place for their children to play rather than to have them in an apartment or a row brick house. It is further felt that the morale of the members of the Police and Fire Departments would be improved due to better living conditions.

This legislation has the approval of the White House Police, the Metropolitan Police Department, the Police Association of the District of Columbia, and Local 36, Fire Fighters Association of the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIREMEN'S SALARY ACT

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 10060) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered

in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 405 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 72), as amended (sec. 4-821, D. C. Code), is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"(e) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (c) of this section, the period June 27 to June 30, 1956, both dates inclusive, shall constitute a special pay period for the officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the White House Police force, and the United States Park Police force. Each day during such period shall be a workday for each such officer and member, and the provisions of subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of the first section of the Act entitled "An act to provide a 5-day week for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the White House Police force," approved August 15, 1950 (64 Stat. 447), as amended (sec. 4-904, D. C. Code), shall not be applicable during such period."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953, so as to have the Police Department pay and work periods coincide, and thereby to eliminate certain administrative difficulties.

Until July 1, 1953, the pay periods and the work periods for the Metropolitan Police force coincided, with both the pay period and the work period commencing on a Sunday and ending on a Saturday. This coincidence made it possible for the Police force to be at greater strength during the peak days of police activity—Friday, Saturday, and Sunday—while at the same time allowing the police officers their two days off per week on the less active days of the week. The Salary Act of 1953, however, went into effect on July 1, 1953, a Wednesday, causing the Police force pay periods to begin on that day and end on a Tuesday. Because of the need for greater police strength at the weekend, it is not feasible to make the Police work period coincide with the pay period, and the lack of coincidence tends to create administrative difficulties in the department and hardship for the officers.

The bill establishes a four-day transitional pay period, beginning June 27 and ending June 30, 1956. During this four-day period, the days-off provision in existing law would be suspended, and all members of the Police force would be on duty. It is understood the members of the force have no objection to this provision. Beginning Sunday, July 1, 1956, the work period and the pay period would coincide.

The cost of the bill, resulting from the additional police services during the four-day transition period, will be approximately \$25,000. The current appropriation for the Police Department is sufficient to absorb the cost. No additional cost to the District will be incurred in the future.

July 1, 1956, is a particularly opportune time to change from the present

pay period to a standard biweekly pay period running from Sunday to Saturday, since July 1, 1956, a Sunday, is the first day of the new fiscal year.

A bill to accomplish the same objective for the Fire Department was enacted as Public Law 139 of the 83d Congress.

The legislation has the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MERITORIOUS SERVICE BY POLICE AND FIRE DEPARTMENTS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 10375) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide recognition for meritorious service by members of the Police and Fire Departments of the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1929, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the first section of the act entitled "An act to provide recognition for meritorious service by members of the Police and Fire Departments of the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1929, is amended to read as follows:

"That for the official recognition of outstanding acts in the line of duty by the members of the Police and Fire Departments of the District of Columbia there shall be awarded annually 1 gold medal and 1 or more silver medals, appropriately inscribed, to those members of each Department who have by outstanding or conspicuous services earned such awards."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to enlarge the opportunities for the members of both Departments to receive more than 1 silver medal award in any 1 year.

The chairman of the Commissioners' Committee of Award for Valor, Police and Fire Departments, has recommended that it be made possible to award 1 or more silver medals to appropriate recipients due to the fact that in recent years, with the enormous growth of our city, the Committee has found great difficulty in the bestowing of the silver medal of valor on only 1 member of each Department, especially when the same act of heroism is performed by 2 or more officers of any one Department. The Committee also felt that there should be only one gold medal for each Department, when merited, as is now provided by law.

This legislation has the approval of the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BILL

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, may I be recognized for 3 minutes in connection with one of the bills which is to come up on District day? I would like to ask a question of the chairman of the committee relative to the compensation bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I want to ask the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], who is acting as chairman relative to the bill H. R. 3015, the District workmen's compensation bill, which the gentleman was instrumental in getting out of committee and which was reported, as to when we may expect to have the bill called up. It is not on the calendar for consideration today.

Mr. HARRIS. All I can say to my distinguished colleague is that I had no advance information regarding the program today. The chairman of the committee could not be here today and asked me to act as the chairman today, which I was glad to do. I observe that the bill was not included in the program for this week. Today being District Day, the bills which were programed were called up and have now been passed and acted on by the House.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION BILL, 1957

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11177) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes. Pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to not to exceed 2 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and one-half by myself.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I have no objection to general debate being set at 2 hours, 1 hour on each side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11177, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman

from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] will be recognized for 1 hour; and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 18 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, our subcommittee has the responsibility each year of reviewing the overall activities of the Department of Agriculture. We sit for weeks questioning witnesses from the Department, studying the facts and figures having to do with the various activities and programs in the broad field of American agriculture.

The gentleman from Minnesota and I, as well as other members of our subcommittee, have been at this job for several years. In that period of time we have come to understand, to a considerable degree, many of the programs, but it is extremely difficult to be really conversant with every field of activity that is touched by the Department of Agriculture.

It was my privilege to serve under the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN] for several years while he was chairman of this subcommittee. The American farmer has never had a better friend. H. CARL ANDERSEN knows farm problems and he knows the Department. As a member of this subcommittee and as chairman, he has made full use of such knowledge to the best interests of agriculture and the Nation.

I also want to thank the other members of the subcommittee for their help and cooperation in bringing this bill to you today. Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. DEANE, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. HORAN, and Mr. VURSELL deserve full credit for their contributions to this effort. I do not believe any group could be more devoted to American agriculture and its place in the general economy of the Nation.

We have been helped on that subcommittee by the staff member who devotes his attention to that subject, Mr. Ross Pope. He has worked with us for a number of years, and I believe he has more information at his fingertips and more sound judgment with regard to various agricultural programs than perhaps any man in the country. I wish to pay this tribute to these gentlemen because I have worked with them.

We have brought you a very good bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture this year, particularly in view of the circumstances with which agriculture and those who farm are faced.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I said the other day in our Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, and I want to repeat it here that I have found the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] through the years, devoted to the best interests of agriculture. When I say agriculture, I mean nationwide. I do not know of a man in the Congress who has tried to do more for agriculture, as we know it, than the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. I say that



after having served with him on the Appropriations Committee for 14 years. I feel that the House should realize that it is largely through the efforts of the gentleman from Mississippi that the avenues of exporting farm commodities have again been opened.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] was joined in that great effort by our colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

I want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I think he has performed a great service to agriculture.

Mr. WHITTEN. I wish to say to my friend and colleague from Minnesota that his kind words are much appreciated. Under his chairmanship one time and my chairmanship the next time, and it alternated over recent years, the committee has worked steadfastly for the benefit of agriculture in the United States. I do deeply appreciate his statement.

Mr. Chairman, in this bill we have tried to deal with the problem which agriculture has faced and which is one of the rather serious problems. Agricultural income has gone down drastically in the last several years. We find that farm income the last few years has gone down as much as 24 percent, whereas the income of the rest of the people of the country has gone up 14 percent.

We have checked into this matter of acreage reduction. We find that the cotton farmer has been reduced 35 percent and the acreage of the wheat farmer cut 25 percent. While we are curtailing production in the United States to the hardship of certain groups of farmers who have had their operations reduced, hoping that it might be some basis to correct the situation, we find that foreign agriculture has increased to a greater extent than our own agriculture has decreased. Over a period of years we have been trying to bring worldwide supply and demand into balance by working on our own country. Certainly the experience of the last few years has proven that cannot be done.

This being an appropriation bill, we cannot change the law governing cotton acreage or corn acreage; we cannot do anything in this bill toward price stabilization. There are many things we cannot do to correct situations that bother those engaged in agriculture. The thing we can do is try to give thought to those programs that may be of slight benefit in meeting the problems we have today.

Among those programs is that of research. This committee has always been very much interested in agricultural research. Today, due largely to newspaper articles and editorials in every farm magazine and disseminated by every farm organization, people have come to realize the great benefits that may inure to agriculture through the research program. Not only do the newspapers and magazines insist upon it in their editorial columns, but also in their news items.

I would point out that in the last 4 years we have made substantial increase in the funds for research. One of our problems in this bill has been in trying to see that there is no duplication, in

trying to see that State and local governments put up their part of the funds, and in trying to see that projects are such as to be of real benefit.

In this bill we have substantially increased funds for research. We have provided funds for a seed storage facility, where we will accumulate basic stocks of early seeds that we have in this country for future use in meeting the needs of agriculture.

We have included funds for a poultry house at Beltsville; we have established a laboratory in Texas, and we have provided increased funds for soil and water research. In other words, what we have been doing is to allocate those funds so as to help the farmers throughout the length and breadth of the United States in the various fields of agricultural research; and we feel we have done a good job in that regard.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I want to thank the committee for including in the appropriation bill for the Agriculture Department this year funds for the research laboratory at Winter Haven. I note that you have reduced the amount considerably. I wonder if the gentleman would make a general statement on that and if the Senate in further exploring this matter is inclined to give it a little additional consideration, would the gentleman's committee feel kindly toward that?

Mr. WHITTEN. I may say to the gentleman from Florida, who has been vitally interested in this project and who appeared before us with a strong delegation, that in approving this project we have agreed with the gentleman's presentation to our committee. In our years of experience on this committee we have found that when you once sell the Budget on an item, as the gentleman and his cohorts have sold the Department and the committee, frequently the amount of money is at a maximum. As a result we find it necessary to hold the amount down in order to bring about a further review by the Department. But we do mean to go along with this project and to make it a sound one. Should it develop that these funds will not meet the need, it will have our sympathetic consideration to the extent it is necessary to help bring about, whatever it takes.

Mr. HALEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I want to say to the gentleman from Florida that first of all we were very much impressed with the attitude of the people of Florida in trying to meet the problem of the burrowing nematode in the citrus industry, which is the greatest single fruit industry in the entire world by far. Secondly, we were a little confused about the Budget item because previously we had had some overtures for laboratory funds even less than we allowed in this bill. However, I am sure that in the other body this will be worked out. I am only happy that

we have made a start because I think the people of Florida richly deserve every proper Federal assistance in connection with your problem down there. It is something that should affect the whole Nation and it is something of a continuing nature. But we have made a start, I will say to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WHITTEN. Another item that is of prime interest to many people in the Congress and to the country as a whole is the school lunch program. That has been increased in this bill by over \$16½ million. For a number of years the Congress has held the annual appropriation down to about \$83 million. The States and local people have put up about four times that amount. But notwithstanding these efforts, 31 States ran out of funds during the spring of this year and were unable to finish out the school term. In view of the ever-increasing number of students in our schools, and in view of the fact that more schools are participating in the program, the committee felt it was time that a substantial increase be made for this program. I would point out, however, that this is not a program for which the Federal Government should pay the whole cost. If we provide greatly increased amounts of money at the Federal level, you will find there will be less interest at the local levels. So we have to balance the need so as to bring out a really strengthened program. May I say that a considerably larger number of commodities are expected to be available from purchases by section 32 funds and from other sources. The committee has approved this action after several years; in fact, it has directed the Department to take action in that direction.

We have in this bill also increased money for soil-conservation technicians. We are all familiar with the soil bank and with the pending legislation which would authorize it; we are familiar with the Department's efforts to bring about some improvement in farm conditions through the soil-conservation program. Yet the record shows that during the last number of years the soil technicians available to the soil-conservation districts to render this technical assistance are approximately one to each district. That is wholly inadequate. We have made substantial increases in the funds available for technical assistance in the soil-conservation districts. The increasing workload which will be made necessary by the soil-bank program will require additional funds beyond those in this bill. The funds in this bill are for the regular districts, the regular organization. We feel that it will be much more sound and the Government will get much more return if the work is carried out through the regular organizations and in the regular way.

We have carried forward in this bill 3 provisions which created quite a discussion last year. The record shows that the inventory of the Commodity Credit Corporation has increased from \$1 billion in 1952 to \$6 billion in 1955. For most of that time, the Department of Agriculture was not even offering these commodities in world trade on a competitive basis. It was at the insistence of this subcommittee that we first got

them to offer limited quantities for sale in world trade, and we got them to sell additional quantities. Last year we finally got them to offer 19 commodities. We were able to get them to offer everything except cotton in world trade at less than the price offered in the United States, on the theory that it was much cheaper to move these commodities instead of paying storage and reducing acreage, and thereby putting the American farmer out of his home.

Beginning this spring they finally offered 1 million bales of cotton. They sold it in 60 days. They had hoped to sell it in 7 months. But, I was displeased, as was our committee, that now they have changed the rules in offering the whole 6.7 million bales of cotton and are turning down bids. This means that once again they are setting up an umbrella over world production. We have not covered that as fully as I would like in this report, but the Department gave us their assurance that, if their present practice did not bring the desired results in moving the commodities in world trade as the American farmer has a right for them to be moved, the present approach would be changed, and they would offer limited amounts for sale on a competitive basis and sell it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. Referring to page 13 of the report with reference to the Foreign Agricultural Service, the gentleman will recall that Public Law 480 is administered primarily by the Foreign Agricultural Service. My question is this: Does the gentleman feel, as the result of the hearing this year, that the Foreign Agricultural Service is doing a better job and is able to meet this problem of the sale of our produce in world trade? Does he feel that they have done an improved job?

Mr. WHITTEN. I think they are doing a splendid job if you take into consideration all of the problems they have had. They have had this change from the old attaché service to the new one. I have had many people come to me inquiring about the possibility of obtaining personnel. They are not really salesmen as such.

We put in a provision last year to bring in information as to what foreign countries were doing in regard to their commodities. They are making full reports to Congress now showing what has happened throughout the world and what the demand and supply situation is. This, in turn, leads to selling in world trade, so that we can get the Department to offer these commodities for sale on a competitive basis.

Mr. SPRINGER. My second question is this. The Director of the Foreign Agricultural Service informed me last year that they had increased the number of agricultural attachés, who are the people primarily who look for these buyers in foreign countries. He informed me that they had increased the number from something like 50 to something like 90 in 1955. Is there any expansion of that program being considered in order

to get these salesmen the gentleman mentioned just a moment ago?

Mr. WHITTEN. I think the funds will provide for some additional people. They had funds last year for more people than they were able to employ. The reason is that it takes a man who can fit into the program for a particular country, who knows agriculture, and who has a lot of other qualifications that enter into the makeup of a good man for that purpose. We are giving them funds as fast as they themselves think that they can get needed personnel.

Mr. SPRINGER. I have this third question. Are there any funds in this bill to implement Public Law 480? It was my understanding the other day from the Department of Agriculture that they were almost out of funds.

Mr. WHITTEN. Public Law 480 funds do not come in this bill, except for reimbursements to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Of course, Public Law 480 can be operated under the umbrella of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. SPRINGER. My point was this. What the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] has just stated does not fully answer my question. Are there funds for the implementation of Public Law 480?

Mr. WHITTEN. Public Law 480, as I recall, provided that the Commodity Credit Corporation as a corporation shall provide funds for its operation. We, in turn, in this bill restore the funds to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Frankly, the Corporation itself is getting close to the ceiling of its authority. There are two sources of funds to that Corporation. One is for the Congress to increase the borrowing authority. The other is through the sale of commodities, the money received therefrom being in turn available to meet all of the obligations of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In this bill we do have substantial amounts for the restoration of the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation which, in turn, will strengthen it in carrying out its various obligations.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. In this bill we have \$67,477,228 that will be reimbursed to the Commodity Credit Corporation for exports under Public Law 480.

Mr. WHITTEN. In other words, the Commodity Credit Corporation has advanced that money and in this bill we repay the CCC for what it has spent in the past.

Mr. HORAN. If the gentleman will yield to me for a moment, he will find in the table on page 25 a special commodity disposal program. My colleague from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] mentioned the exact amount, but on page 25 of this bill the gentleman will find \$257 million. Of course, Public Law 480 is operated under that fund.

Mr. SPRINGER. Does that answer my question? I am still somewhat in the dark. Does that answer my question whether the Commodity Credit Corporation has adequate funds on hand with which to implement Public Law 480? The answer is yes, is that true?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is true at the moment. If we pass this bill it will restore over \$1 billion to the Commodity Credit Corporation which will give them that much increased operating capital. So that they definitely will have ample funds to meet that problem.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I should like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation of the action of the gentleman's committee in increasing the amount for the hot school lunch program.

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate the statement of my friend and colleague from West Virginia. May I say further, we have also urged the Department to make more commodities available under the purchase program, which will be in addition to the funds.

Mr. BAILEY. Now that flour and cornmeal are being processed, I see no reason why they should not be made available in the school hot lunch program.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would now like to discuss the committee's action under the various appropriation items included in the bill.

#### AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

The committee recommends a total of \$49,972,000 for research, an increase of \$10,816,845 over 1956. The increase will provide additional funds for nearly every phase of research activity conducted under this appropriation. It is in addition to over \$8,000,000 of increases granted for this purpose since 1953, and is an increase of 56 percent in the past 4 years.

The budget for 1957 included funds for three new major construction projects: \$810,000 to build a new research laboratory at Winter Haven, Fla.; \$225,000 for a modern poultry brooder house at Beltsville, Md.; and \$450,000 for a national seed storage facility. Of the amounts requested, the committee has approved \$500,000 for the Winter Haven Laboratory, \$150,000 for the poultry brooder house at Beltsville, and \$300,000 for the national seed storage facility. Also, the committee has included \$100,000 of the \$330,000 requested for research on assistance to low-income farm families.

The committee recommends that the savings be used to strengthen other activities which also urgently need attention. It proposes that \$200,000 be allocated to initiate construction of a horticultural, soil, and water research laboratory in the Rio Grande Valley of Texas. It also recommends that the funds for the National Arboretum be increased from the budget estimate of \$372,570 to \$500,000, to speed up work on buildings, roads, and other physical facilities at



the Arboretum. The balance of the saving will be used to intensify soil and water conservation research work, particularly with reference to the Department's programs on the 11 major watersheds.

During the hearings on the bill numerous members and other witnesses made what appears to be a good case for special research projects costing limited amounts of money. The committee has not dealt separately with each of these because the Department, within the large amounts provided in this bill for research, has ample authority and funds to meet these and other similar research problems.

A total of \$22,594,000 is recommended for plant and animal disease and pest control. This is an increase of \$2,413,300 over funds available for 1956 and is a decrease of \$1,106,000 in the budget estimate. The amount recommended includes the following increases: \$500,000 for the contingency fund for emergency outbreaks of insects; \$500,000 to be transferred to the Bureau of Customs for increased baggage checks to prevent importation of dangerous insects; \$110,300 for increased inspection at ports of entry; \$53,000 to strengthen inspection and quarantine work along the Mexican border; and \$1,750,000 for eradication of the gypsy moth.

The committee is cognizant of the serious threat of the gypsy moth in the New England area and the need to take precautions to prevent its spread to the rest of the country. It had a great deal of testimony presented to it on this subject, most of which, however, was in support of an increase of only \$1,500,000. The increase provided, together with the sum of \$545,200 already included in the budget, will provide a total of \$2,295,200 to meet this problem during the coming fiscal year.

In working out the program for the use of the additional \$500,000 to be transferred to the Bureau of Customs, the Department is directed to develop a program which will prevent passengers from embarking at foreign ports on carriers destined for the United States with dangerous articles and materials in their luggage. It is recommended that all customs notices and declaration forms be revised to include adequate notice to travelers as to what items are not permitted to enter this country. It is also suggested that prominent signs and notices be posted at foreign points of embarkation to bring this matter to the attention of those destined for American ports. The committee also believes that, as far as practicable, arrangements should be made for preinspection at foreign ports to reduce to a minimum the inspection required upon arrival in the United States. The committee is of the opinion that the great majority of travelers will cooperate fully and will be anxious to avoid carrying prohibited articles in their luggage if given adequate advance notice.

The committee recommends the sum of \$15,500,000 for meat inspection, an increase of \$131,000 over the appropriation for 1956 and a decrease of \$245,000 in the budget estimate. The committee feels that efficient operation of this service will permit it to meet its workload

during the coming fiscal year within the amount provided.

The full budget estimate of \$29,503,708 is recommended for payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico. This is an increase of \$4,750,000 over funds provided for fiscal year 1956. It represents an increase of nearly \$17 million in the funds of this program since 1953, an increase of 133 percent.

For the fiscal year 1957, the sum of \$3,500,000 is recommended for research on diseases of animals and poultry. This is an increase of \$1,555,000 over funds appropriated for 1956 and is a decrease of \$493,000 in the budget estimate. These funds are provided for the operation of the foot-and-mouth disease laboratory at Plum Island. Research officials of the Department estimate that this laboratory will be completed and in full operation in July 1956.

House Document No. 383, dated April 18, 1956, included a supplemental budget estimate of \$18,915,000 for the construction of an animal disease laboratory at Beltsville, Md. The committee recommends an appropriation of \$10 million for the coming fiscal year for this purpose.

In June 1955, the major animal disease research laboratories in Washington, D. C., Auburn, Ala., and Denver, Colo., were closed due to the lack of adequate safeguards to protect the health of laboratory workers. An appropriation of \$250,000 was included in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956, for plans and surveys for new laboratory facilities. Preliminary plans have been completed and form the basis for the estimate considered by the committee.

The committee is not fully satisfied with the proposed plans. It is particularly concerned with the proposal to locate these facilities at Beltsville. The former laboratory facilities were closed because of hazards to human and animal health. The location of the new facility at a research station where numerous persons and animals are located in connection with other types of activities, would present the same problem. The committee also questions the advisability of locating a facility of this type in an area where it could become a threat to the health of millions of people in the event of attack by hostile forces.

#### EXTENSION SERVICE

The sum of \$49,615,000 is included in the bill for payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico. This is an increase of \$5,125,000 over funds available for 1956 and is a decrease of \$500,000 in the budget estimate. The amount recommended represents an increase of over \$17 million above the appropriations for the fiscal year 1953, an increase of 54 percent.

The budget estimates included an increase of \$890,000 to expand educational work in low-income areas under the rural development program. The committee recommends a reduction of \$500,000 in this amount in the belief that this program should be handled within the regular functions of the Extension Service. Since the purpose of the Extension Service is to work with farmers of all income levels to assist them in carrying

out their farming activities, the committee believes that the problem can be met more adequately through added emphasis by regular personnel.

The committee recommends the sum of \$3,650,000 for the Federal Extension Service, an increase of \$20,000 over appropriations for 1956, and a decrease of \$65,000 in the budget estimate. This amount includes \$2 million for administration and coordination and \$1,650,000 for penalty mail. The amounts recommended appear adequate to meet the needs of this Service during the coming fiscal year in view of sums expended during the past several years for this purpose.

#### FARMERS COOPERATIVE SERVICE

The bill includes \$550,000 for the fiscal year 1957, an increase of \$123,000 over the appropriation for 1956 and a decrease of \$27,000 in the budget estimate. While the committee realizes the value of this program to the farmer cooperatives of the country, it is not satisfied that the program is making an effective contribution to those organizations. The testimony presented to the committee on this item did not support the funds requested. The committee urges the Service to review its programs and operations and to develop a better basis for future budget requests.

#### SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$67,500,000 for conservation operations, an increase of \$4,557,255 over the 1956 appropriation and an increase of \$2,285,000 in the budget estimate.

The committee has substantially increased funds for soil conservation technicians to enable this organization to meet the increasing requirements of the soil conservation districts, both old and new. It is contemplated that extra and outside activities which do not fit into the district type of operation will be met from allocations from soil bank authorizations and will be in addition to funds in this bill.

It has come to the committee's attention that the soil technicians in this agency are frequently required to devote a considerable amount of time to routine clerical duties. The committee recommends that a portion of the increase provided for the next year be used to employ clerical personnel to relieve these technicians of clerical work so as to better use their technical training and abilities.

In view of the terrific demand for vegetative covering and seedlings which will develop from the new soil bank program, the Soil Conservation Service should take proper steps to see that this need is met. Since the total supply of such seedlings apparently will be far short of that necessary to meet the full demand which will grow out of the expanded program, it is apparent that the combined efforts of the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, State and local agencies, and private nurseries will be called upon to the fullest extent. Therefore, the committee feels that this organization should review its conservation nursery program to make certain that all of the nurseries formerly operated by this Service are available to meet this need.

These nurseries should either be operated directly by the Soil Conservation Service, or should be handled on a cooperative or contract basis with State, local, or private organizations.

The committee is not entirely satisfied with the soil conservation research program of the Department. It has some doubts that the transfer of this responsibility to the Agricultural Research Service was a wise action. There is some question whether this type of research can ever be conducted satisfactorily and effectively outside of the direct jurisdiction of the Soil Conservation Service. The committee has taken no action to transfer the funds back to this appropriation heading, recognizing that the primary responsibility for organizational matters rests with the Secretary. It feels, however, that the Secretary should give this matter his personal attention to be certain that the most satisfactory and effective results are obtained.

The committee has provided a substantial increase in soil and water conservation research funds appropriated under the Agricultural Research Service, in view of the urgent need to expand soil conservation programs and to speed up the watershed protection and flood prevention activities. It expects the Soil Conservation Service to take an active part in determining how these funds can be most effectively used to improve research findings in this field. It feels that particular emphasis should be given to research within the 11 existing major watersheds.

The appropriations recommended for the coming fiscal year include \$17,500,000 for watershed protection and \$12 million for flood prevention. The amount recommended for watershed protection is an increase of \$5,505,935 over 1956 and an increase of \$1,500,000 over the budget estimate. The appropriation included for flood prevention is an increase of \$2 million over 1956 and an increase of \$1,300,000 over the budget estimate.

As was pointed out last year, construction on the 11 major watersheds authorized in 1936 is only about 25 percent complete after 20 years of work. Testimony from Department witnesses indicates that, on the basis of the amounts included in the 1957 budget, it will take up to 35 years to complete most of these projects. In view of the urgent need to complete these projects as rapidly as possible to conserve the soil, and in view of the additional cost which will result from stretching out the period of construction, the committee has exceeded the budget estimates for these programs. The committee urges that action be taken by the Department to push ahead the completion date of these projects.

The sum of \$232,000 is recommended for 1957 for the Eden Valley project in Wyoming. In view of a delay due to construction difficulties, no funds were appropriated for this purpose in 1956. It is expected that this project will be completed in 1962.

#### AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM SERVICE

For the fiscal year 1957, an appropriation of \$217,500,000 is recommended, an increase of \$3 million over funds appro-

priated for 1956. It is expected that the amount recommended will provide adequate funds to meet all commitments made to participants under the 1956 program authorization. The committee recognizes the obligation of the Government under the program announced last year. If the amount provided proves insufficient, the committee will recommend additional funds when needed.

An advance authorization of \$250 million for the 1957 program is included in the bill. This is the same amount as was provided for the 1956 program.

The committee is of the opinion that this well-established program of the Department should supplement whatever soil bank or diverted acreage program may be put into effect. For many years, this program has met a definite need for a long-range conservation, and the committee feels that it should be continued in the future, regardless of any other conservation and acreage reserve program which may be adopted.

#### AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

A total of \$26 million is recommended for marketing research and service, an increase of \$1,672,860 over 1956 and a reduction of \$581,000 in the budget estimate. This amount includes \$13 million for marketing research and agricultural estimates and an equal amount for marketing services.

The increase of \$1,347,370 for research and agricultural estimates provides additional funds to expand and improve the crop and livestock reporting service and to increase marketing research work. The committee has not approved the proposed increase for research on problems of low-income farmers under the rural development program. The committee feels that there is no real difference between the regular program designed to aid and assist all the farmers of the Nation, and those proposed for low-income farm families.

For marketing services, the committee has approved an increase of \$325,490 over funds provided for 1956. The amount recommended includes an increase of \$150,000 to expand and improve marketing news services in various areas of the country. The balance of the increase will strengthen grain and tobacco inspection services, supervision of federally licensed warehouses, and administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act.

The sum of \$1,100,000 is recommended in the bill for payments to States, Territories, and possessions, an increase of \$100,000 over funds available for 1956 and a decrease of \$100,000 in the budget estimate. Payments are made on a matched-fund basis to State and Territorial marketing agencies for projects aimed at getting into use, in the marketing of farm products, improved methods and practices developed in the marketing research program. The additional funds provided will cover increased work designed to reduce spoilage, increase marketing outlets, reduce marketing costs and improve quality of products.

The committee recommends the sum of \$100 million for the school-lunch program for the fiscal year 1957. This is an

increase of \$16,764,788 over funds provided for 1956.

Much evidence has come to the committee of very strong support throughout the country for an increase in this program. Numerous Members of Congress as well as individuals representing organizations interested in this program have urged the committee to provide a sizable increase for this appropriation.

Even before the passage of legislation establishing this program, this committee strongly supported it. Year after year, it has recommended the maximum possible appropriations for this purpose and has encouraged the use of surplus commodities of the Department to supplement such funds. For each of the past 3 years, it has restored large cuts proposed in the annual budgets, and has resisted all efforts to curtail this program.

The committee recognizes that, while Federal appropriations have remained approximately the same during recent years, the needs of the schools for funds under this program have continued to increase in view of steadily increasing school enrollments, in view of the larger number of schools participating each year, and in view of the increased cost of serving lunches. It believes that the need has reached the point where a rather substantial increase in funds for this purpose is necessary. Therefore, it has gone above the budget by \$16,764,000 to provide the sum of \$100 million for fiscal year 1957.

#### FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

For the fiscal year 1957, the committee recommends \$3,600,000 for this program, an increase of \$157,000 over appropriations for 1956, and a reduction of \$200,000 in the budget estimate. In view of large increases granted to this activity during the past several years, the committee feels that the amount recommended for the coming year is ample. The increase will permit the Service to expand studies of foreign competition with American agricultural products, and will permit the strengthening of efforts to expand American export markets for United States agricultural products.

At various times the committee has received reports and charts showing the volume of agricultural exports during recent years. It has noted that such releases reflect such information in terms of total disposals of United States commodities, including donation, barter exchanges, grants, relief shipments, and sales for foreign currency under Public Law 480. Since they do not provide sufficient breakdown to indicate the quantity sold for dollars, the committee considers such releases to be misleading. Therefore, the committee urges that all future releases of this type clearly differentiate between sales for dollars through normal channels and exports made under various other categories of disposal.

The committee is not opposed to disposals through all channels available. It believes, however, that every effort should be made to sell United States commodities in world trade for dollars, prior to giving them away or exporting



them under relief or grant programs. Also, it feels that the American public is entitled to know to what extent total exports result in sales for dollars.

#### COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

The committee recommends \$780,000 for the coming fiscal year, an increase of \$5,000 over funds available for 1956 and a decrease of \$7,400 in the budget estimate.

The Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956, provided \$33,000 for regulation of futures trading in onions pursuant to Public Law 174, 84th Congress. However, the program did not become effective until September of last year and the appropriation covered only 10 months of operation. The increase recommended in this bill will place this program on a full year basis in 1957.

#### COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE

An appropriation of \$41 million is included in the bill for the agricultural adjustment programs, an increase of \$1,850,000 over funds appropriated for 1956 and a decrease of \$463,000 in the budget estimate.

In its report last year, the committee recommended that the regular full-time employees of the ASC county offices be required to meet civil service qualifications for their work and be paid on a basis comparable to other Federal agencies. This recommendation was based on a need to strengthen the personnel policies in the county offices, so as to hold such personnel fully responsible for performance of their duties, reduce turnover, and increase employment deficiency.

Pursuant to this directive, the Department has developed a 3-year program to increase the rates of pay for county committee employees to a level comparable to those paid by Federal agencies and private employers in the same areas. The increase recommended for this appropriation item will enable the Department to undertake this program.

The committee recommends the sum of \$62,600,000 for Sugar Act program, an increase of \$3 million over funds appropriated for 1956 and a decrease of \$5 million in the budget estimate. The funds provided under this appropriation are used to establish consumption requirements, administer quotas, and make payments to domestic producers of cane and beet sugar who meet specified conditions. Since the inception of the program in 1938, collections of excise and import taxes have totaled \$1,298,858,419 and expenditures have amounted to \$986,210,043.

#### FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

The committee recommends the full budget estimate of \$6,210,000 for 1957. In addition, it recommends an increase of \$500,000 for administrative and operating expenses to be paid from premium income. During the fiscal year 1956, this program is operating in about 950 counties. With the amounts recommended for next year, the program will be expanded to an additional 50 counties.

#### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

The budget for 1957 included the sum of \$145,300,000 for rural electrification

loans, together with a contingency fund of \$25 million. The budget also included the sum of \$49½ million for the rural telephone program. In view of strong representations from the REA co-ops throughout the country that total funds of \$214 million will be required for rural electrification loans, instead of the \$170,300,000 included in the budget, the committee has increased the contingency fund by the sum of \$43,700,000. Also, in view of indications that \$100 million may be required for the rural telephone programs, in lieu of the sum of \$49½ million included in the budget, the committee has included a contingency fund of \$50½ million for loans under that program.

For administrative expenses, the committee recommends the sum of \$8,500,000, an increase of \$364,215 over 1956 appropriations and a decrease of \$200,000 in the budget estimate. The increase recommended will enable the administration to meet the increased workload involved in processing telephone loans and handling the construction program. It also will enable the administration to give closer attention to the protection of the Government's investment through its loan security work.

#### FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

The committee recommends the full budget estimates for loan authorizations administered by this agency as follows: Farm ownership loans, \$19 million; production and subsistence loans, \$140 million; and soil and water conservation loans, \$5,500,000. In addition, the committee has, for the first time, provided a contingency fund of \$50 million to meet unforeseeable needs for loans during the coming fiscal year. This contingency fund is similar to the one which has been carried in the REA portion of the bill for a number of years and is based on the same underlying considerations.

We have provided this contingency fund for all the loan programs of FHA should the need for additional funds arise, including funds for continuation of the rural housing program for the coming year.

The full budget estimate of \$26,405,000 is included in the bill for salaries and expenses, an increase of \$215,520 over the appropriation for 1956.

In the opinion of the committee, attention should be given to a thorough study of the organization and programs of this agency. Recent reports concerning the administration of this organization have been a source of concern to the committee. The committee recognizes that the farm is a unit that requires the most effective balance between farm and home management. It believes that the programs of this agency are vitally needed, particularly under present agricultural conditions. The committee has approved the increases in the budget recommendations so that the organization can restore the program for home supervisors, in part at least, which was discontinued several years ago. In the opinion of the committee, this can be one of the most vital programs to meet the needs of low-income farmers in these critical times.

#### OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

An appropriation of \$2.7 million is recommended for the General Counsel for the coming fiscal year, an increase of \$43,000 over funds available for the fiscal year 1956 and a reduction of \$62,700 in the budget estimate. The increase covers additional legal service relative to the determination of surface rights on mining claims under the act of July 23, 1955.

#### OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

The committee recommends \$2.5 million for the Secretary's Office, an increase of \$10,195 over funds provided for 1956 and a decrease of \$10,500 in the budget estimate.

#### OFFICE OF INFORMATION

For the coming year, the committee recommends \$1,325,000 for the Office of Information, an increase of \$26,400 over funds available for 1956 and a decrease of \$23,100 in the budget estimate. The increase will permit this office to conduct a special review of all Department publications. Such a study will cover the distribution, format, readability, and use of bulletins and publications. It is expected that such a study will improve the usefulness of these releases and it is hoped that it will result in a saving of funds in the future.

#### LIBRARY

The bill includes \$725,000 for the library during 1956, an increase of \$25,050 over 1956 and a decrease of \$48,000 in the budget estimate. The increase will enable the library to meet the increased needs of the research personnel of the Department for scientific information resulting from expanding research programs of the Department.

#### COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The sum of \$929,287,178 is included in the bill for 1957 for restoration of capital impairment of the Corporation through June 30, 1955.

The committee wishes to direct attention to the fact that nearly half of the amount is required for mandatory non-basic commodities, which includes principally butter and milk. It also calls attention to the fact that only \$194.5 million of the total is chargeable to basic commodities.

The committee recommends the full budget estimate of \$31 million for the administrative expenses of the Commodity Credit Corporation during the coming fiscal year. The small increase over funds available for the current fiscal year will enable the Corporation to meet its responsibilities under price-support programs in the coming year and will cover any additional responsibilities resulting from the new soil-bank program. Under the bill recently passed by the House, the financing of the soil-bank program during the next year will be handled through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

#### RESEARCH ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL AGRICULTURAL MATERIALS

The committee recommends \$314,000 for the coming fiscal year, the same amount as provided for the fiscal year 1956. With the amount recommended, the Department can continue at present levels its investigations of domestic production of vegetable tannins, develop-

ment of a domestic source of castor oil, and research on domestic production of strategic fibers.

#### REIMBURSEMENTS TO COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

For reimbursements to the Commodity Credit Corporation for non-price-support activities, the bill for the coming year provides funds as follows: annual disease eradication, \$13,060,954; grading and classing activities, \$367,740; and special commodity disposal programs, \$257,420,988. These funds cover reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation for advances made for these purposes during the fiscal year 1955.

The reimbursement for animal disease eradication includes \$1,269,330 for advances made for eradication of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico. It also includes \$11,791,624 to cover costs incurred for an accelerated brucellosis eradication program authorized by the Agricultural Act of 1954.

The reimbursement of \$257,420,988 under the heading "Special commodity disposal programs" includes \$101,130,155 for the International Wheat Agreement; \$88,628,927 for emergency famine relief to friendly peoples authorized by the act of August 7, 1953; \$67,477,228 for transactions under Public Law 480; and \$184,678 for hay and pasture seeds furnished in drought areas under the act of July 26, 1954.

#### FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The committee has approved administrative expense limitations of \$6,356,000 for the Farm Credit Administration and its member institutions for the coming fiscal year, an increase of \$66,000 over funds authorized for 1956.

The amounts recommended include \$2,230,000 for the parent organization, the Farm Credit Administration, \$550,000 for the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, \$1,932,000 for the Federal intermediate credit banks, and \$1,644,000 for the production credit corporations. These amounts represent limitations on the amount of corporate funds of these organizations which may be used for administrative expenses and are not direct appropriations from the Treasury of the United States.

The small increases provided for the Federal intermediate credit banks and the production credit corporations are necessary to handle an increased volume of loans and discounts growing out of the adverse conditions which have affected agriculture in recent years. These institutions are faced with increasingly difficult credit problems as a result of the cost-price squeeze on farmers and stockmen and the effects of drought and other adverse weather conditions which have affected extensive areas of the country for several years.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I would first like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee for a very good statement on this bill.

May I ask the chairman one question for the record? I believe we should make this record positively clear in case there is need for interpretation.

You will note that on page 5 of the report we use this language under the heading "Soil Conservation":

In this bill, the committee has exceeded the budget for the Soil Conservation Service by \$5 million, to assure adequate technical assistance to an increasing number of soil conservation districts, and to accelerate the watershed protection and flood prevention programs of the Department.

Further, on page 9 we use this language which could be construed as contradictory. This is under the heading of "Soil Conservation Service":

The committee has substantially increased funds for soil conservation technicians to enable this organization to meet the additional responsibilities which will result from the new soil bank program.

I am sure the chairman joins me in the interpretation that despite the need for the soil bank program the increased funds here made available are definitely for additional technical help to soil conservation districts for this nationwide operation.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman is right. Our reference to the soil bank and to the problems that would come from it was an indication that that would increase the need for technicians and all that within the regular existing service. Of course, actually the soil bank is not yet the law and we have had no intention of trying to implement that law through any separate organization. This merely implements the existing Soil Conservation Service so that it can meet its existing problems and such other work as may be referred to it in the future.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct. I appreciate the gentleman's interpretation, which is in agreement with mine.

Now, I would like to say a few words about the bill we have before us. As is customary, the subcommittee chairman has just presented a detailed analysis of the various appropriation items. In the years in which I have served as chairman of the subcommittee it has been my responsibility to make such a presentation to set the stage, so to speak, for debate and approval of our bill. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has done his usual excellent job, and little remains to be said other than by way of emphasis.

#### AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

As has been indicated, we recommend a total of \$49,972,000 for research. This is \$10,816,845 above the appropriation just last year. It is also an increase of over \$18 million over 1953, an increase of 56 percent in just 4 years. That is a most significant increase, and it reflects an important trend both in agricultural appropriations and in the administration of the Department of Agriculture.

Personally, I am pleased with this trend and am proud to have been a party to it. Agricultural research, like most research, is designed to find answers to problems. American agriculture is faced with a complex array of problems ranging all the way from falling commodity prices to invasions of our forest lands by

gypsy moths and our fields by alfalfa aphids. Research takes time and money. Time is always running against us and our only hope to catch up is through expenditure of more money on vital research—and this bill out of our committee makes that additional money available.

As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has said, we have shown our confidence in the research personnel of the Department of Agriculture by leaving them rather wide discretion in the budgeting and use of the funds proposed for research. We have approved the full budget estimate of \$29,503,708 for payments to the States, representing an increase of \$4,750,000 or about 20 percent above the funds provided last fiscal year. This expansion of research in partnership with the States is most encouraging to those of us interested in concrete results from our research dollars.

#### EXTENSION SERVICE

Our committee has taken into consideration the fact that research by itself is no end unless the results of such research are given practical application, and we have accordingly materially expanded the appropriation for the Extension Service. We recommend \$49,615,000 for payments to the States and Territories. This is an increase of \$5,125,000 over last year, and is more than \$17 million above 1953—an increase of 54 percent in 4 years.

You will note the close relationship between the increases for extension and those for research. In the last 4 years, we have provided a total of 54 percent in increases for extension and 56 percent in increases for research. There is a very sound reason for this. From a purely practical standpoint, research is wasted if the results are not applied in actual practice. Primarily, it is the job of the Extension Service to convey research findings to the farm people who need them and thus complete the research process. The Extension Service—all the way from the land-grant college to the county agent and his assistants—bridges the gap between the scientists and the men and women on the soil. That is why I have through the years urged approval of increased appropriations for the Extension Service not only to help our farm people help themselves but also to protect our investment of tax dollars in important agricultural research.

The men and women who make up the Extension Service throughout the Nation have done an outstanding job in their field, and I can assure you that this is one of the wisest possible expenditures of agricultural dollars. I cannot too strongly urge approval of the full amount we propose for this purpose.

#### SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

We are recommending \$67,500,000 for conservation operations—an increase of \$4,557,255 over last year of which \$2,285,000 is above the budget estimate. As one of the more persistent advocates of an expanded and effective Soil Conservation Service, perhaps I owe a brief explanation of my personal position on the subject.



While most of the agricultural programs included in this overall appropriation are for the immediate benefit of agriculture and farm people, the work being carried forward by the Soil Conservation Service is not only of benefit today but represents a permanent contribution to the physical wealth and well-being of our Nation. Many of the problems of agriculture could be solved tomorrow almost as well as today, but this is not true when it comes to conserving our precious soil and water resources. Topsoil is not replaceable. Once it has washed away and been deposited in the Gulf of Mexico or the bottom of the great rivers and tributaries, it is lost forever.

Our scientists have found substitutes for almost everything else, but so far they have not presented us with satisfactory substitutes for soil and water. It therefore behooves us, as a Nation looking to the future, to take steps now to conserve for our own time and for the generations yet to come these irreplaceable resources.

As has been established in the exchange a few moments ago between the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and myself, we fully intend that these increases be made available to the Soil Conservation Service without any contingency upon soil bank or any other legislation which may be subsequently enacted. Reference has been made in our report to the pending soil bank legislation, but that is purely explanatory and has no real bearing upon the funds we propose to appropriate in this bill.

The increases over last year fall in three major categories. As I said earlier, \$4,557,255 of the increase is for conservation operations. This will provide for more technicians in the present conservation districts and also for the staffing of new districts as they are organized. We have also suggested to the Department that clerks be employed where needed to relieve highly skilled and higher salaried technical personnel from clerical duties. By this provision of additional technical guidance and leadership to farmers interested in conservation, we fully expect to obtain many, many times the cost of the program in actual conservation practices.

The second major category is watershed protection, and we propose an increase of \$5,505,935 in this field. This is an increase of \$1,500,000 over the budget estimate. I have a deep personal interest in the watershed protection program as evidenced by my joint authorship of the Andersen-Hope pilot program and active support of Public Law 566 which came the following year.

The watershed programs have been widely accepted and are proving to be extremely popular not only with farm people but also with municipalities seeking protection from flood damages. In my own congressional district, I have seen townspeople join enthusiastically with their neighboring farmers in efforts to advance the watershed projects. I am happy to report that later this year we will start actual construction on one of the major watershed treatment projects in my district and the people in that area are giving it their all-out support.

The appropriation proposed for flood prevention is an increase of \$2 million over last year and an increase of \$1,300,000 over the budget estimate. We hope by increased appropriations and emphasis on this important work to make a further contribution to efforts to reduce the devastating effects of floodwaters on the upper streams with collateral benefits on the main channels themselves.

#### AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM SERVICE

We propose an advance authorization of \$250 million for the 1957 program and an appropriation of \$217,500,000. If this appropriation is insufficient, the committee is agreed that it will recommend more money as needed. We also feel that this program serves an extremely important purpose in its own right and should be continued whether or not a soil bank program is enacted. The fundamental purposes of the two programs are quite different and the enactment of the soil bank would have no bearing on ACP as a conservation program.

#### AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

Research and related marketing services are vital to our agricultural economy. We propose an appropriation of \$26 million to be divided equally between research and marketing services. This is an increase of \$1,672,860 above last year. Personally, I would like to see even more funds made available for this important work if overall budget conditions permitted.

The very substantial increase we propose will facilitate expansion of crop and livestock reporting services and increased marketing research. As the hearings will show, our committee has impressed upon those responsible for research in the Department of Agriculture the desirability of placing increased emphasis on utilization and marketing research to develop new outlets and uses for agricultural products and to expand the old. Proper emphasis on such research can do much to solve the perplexing problem of surpluses of some commodities.

#### SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

As in previous years, we have materially increased above the budget the appropriation for the school lunch program. We propose \$100 million for the next fiscal year—an increase of \$16,764,788 over last year.

Personally, I recognize the urgent need for even greater increases in this item and we propose to meet that need in part at least by increased distribution of surplus foods and perishables under the section 32 program. Despite past increases in the Federal contribution to the school-lunch program, the Federal share of the cost of individual meals served in the public schools has been shrinking each year. This is attributable to both increased school enrollment and improvements in the quality of the meals.

#### FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

We recommend \$3,600,000 for the Foreign Agricultural Service, an increase of \$157,000 over last year. I am sure our colleagues are well aware of the intense interest our committee has demonstrated insofar as the Foreign Agricultural Service is concerned. We have nurtured it

through the years and now we believe it to be on the threshold of outstanding service to American agriculture. With a staff of men and women who excel in their field, this agency is now moving our agricultural products in increasing volume into markets throughout the world. Today, we are not only recapturing old markets lost through inept handling or neglect in previous years, but we are also opening up new markets we never enjoyed before. It is to the advantage of this Nation as well as our customers to move our abundance of food and fiber into world trade channels for the good of all. We are much encouraged by the progress that has been made and look with confidence to the future of this program.

#### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

For electrification loans, we have approved the entire budget estimate of \$145,300,000 in regular funds and have increased the contingency funds from the budget estimate of \$25,000,000 to \$68,700,000. This will make available a total loan authority of \$214,000,000, if necessary, to meet the maximum demand anticipated by the REA co-ops.

The REA program has shown good progress in recent years and we want to assure sufficient loan authority to maintain that progress. Among the encouraging developments in recent months was the approval of a loan to the Elk River Cooperative in Minnesota to facilitate the construction of an atomic-energy generating plant. Here we have demonstrated the pioneering of REA co-ops and in the months and years ahead this new plant is expected to contribute not only to the area it serves but also to the badly needed experience and know-how of this new source of power.

We have also approved the budget estimate of \$49,500,000 in regular loan funds for the telephone loan program plus contingency funds of \$50,500,000 for a total loan authority of \$100,000,000 if needed. Again, we are pleased with the progress that is being made and want to assure sufficient loan authority so that no deserving application will be denied or delayed.

The repayment experience in both loan programs has been so outstanding as to warrant the full confidence of the Congress in them. I strongly urge the approval of our recommendations on these items.

#### FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

We have approved the entire budget estimates for loan authorizations of the Farmers' Home Administration. These include \$19 million for farm ownership loans; \$140 million for production and subsistence loans; and \$5,500,000 for soil and water conservation loans—a total loan authority of \$164,500,000.

Both farm mortgage and short-term debt have been rising sharply in recent years. Accompanied by continuing declines in farm commodity prices and farm income, credit has gradually tightened in farming areas. As a result, it may well be that many farmers who previously had little or no difficulty in obtaining necessary credit from commercial sources will find it necessary to

turn to the Farmers' Home Administration for credit.

This credit problem is being met in two ways. First, I have introduced bills to materially liberalize the credit operations of the Farmers' Home Administration. If enacted, these bills will permit the consolidation of existing indebtedness and also the refinancing of both unsecured and mortgage obligations. A number of other bills have been introduced along the same general lines, hearings have been held by the House Committee on Agriculture, and I hope that such legislation will be enacted at this session.

The other step we are taking is the provision in the bill before us of a contingency fund of \$50 million to meet these anticipated needs as they arise. This additional credit may mean the difference between survival and failure for many good farmers throughout the Nation.

#### COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The committee will note that on page 19 of the report we have made available for restoration to the capital fund of the Commodity Credit Corporation the total sum of \$929,287,178. That constitutes about one-half of the money in this bill.

The point I should like to call to the attention of the committee at this time is that basic commodities, concerning which we have had all the fuss and furor in the Congress recently, have consumed only \$194 million of this \$929 million. In other words, the only loss chargeable to the five basics which could possibly be shown on the books of the Commodity Credit Corporation amounts to approximately one-fifth of the total figure.

If you will refer to the bottom of page 18, you will see that we have expended \$441 million that could be construed as a loss on dairy products, a mandatory nonbasic commodity, and on other nonbasic commodities we have entailed a loss of \$162 million. This, with about \$135 million in administrative expenses, makes up the total of \$929 million restored to the Commodity Credit Corporation in this bill.

I would think the fact that we have found it necessary to restore only \$194 million properly attributable to basics, in itself would be clear proof that the 90 percent of parity price-support program on the basic commodities has not been prohibitive as far as the taxpayers of the United States are concerned. Advocates of flexible price supports would do well to consider that it was necessary to practically give away \$441 million worth of dairy products in this past fiscal year, largely because the Secretary reduced price supports on dairy products from 90 percent to 75 percent. Why, Mr. Chairman, dairy products represent more of a loss to the taxpayers of the Nation than the so-called potato fiasco. But, the point I am emphasizing here now is that in the face of these facts and figures certainly no one can make out a good case for flexible price supports.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, 4 years ago a great general left his profession to become a candidate for the highest office in the land. The general as candidate made two speeches that attracted headlines then, and endless attempts to interpret them ever since.

These two speeches were made with the clear intent of satisfying any qualms the voters might have about candidate Eisenhower's attitude toward the farm program.

One of these speeches was made at Kasson, Minn., on September 6, 1952, in which he said:

And here, and now, without any "ifs" or "buts," I say to you that I stand behind—and the Republican Party stands behind—the price-support laws now on the books. This includes the amendment to the Basic Farm Act, passed by votes of both parties in Congress, to continue through 1954 the price supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity.

On October 4, 1952, he made another speech at Brookings, S. Dak., in which you will find these words:

The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90-percent parity price support and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100-percent parity, with the guaranty in price supports of 90.

This is an election year and because this is an election year, there is ample indication that the administration will put its best foot forward to convince farmers that the inept handling, the lack of a positive program, and the grand economic theories of the past 4 years did not really exist. Like the candidate's words, the administration's deeds will be clouded in explanations, interpretations, and obscurities. Once again they will try to convince farmers that there has been a change of heart—at least until November.

In contrast, I think you will find that the work of our subcommittee on Department of Agriculture appropriations carries the same message year in and year out. Election year politics have not shaped the bill before you today. As in the past, it means what it says. It represents our best efforts to promote the welfare of American agriculture and to guarantee it full partnership in the economy of the Nation.

I have the highest regard for all of the members of this subcommittee and for our chairman, the Honorable JAMIE WHITTEN, of Mississippi. He has always extended to me the utmost courtesy and consideration.

It is a genuine pleasure to serve on this subcommittee. The record is filled with many instances in which we have contributed ideas and concrete suggestions for improving the administration of farm programs for the benefit of farmers and consumers. We only regret that the administration has neglected or ignored these recommendations at the expense of our farm families. I am proud of the fact that the efforts of our subcommittee have been constructive; that they have generated ideas and proposals which have won the approval of thoughtful men seeking answers to the complex problems of modern agriculture. Some

of these ideas have even been accepted belatedly, and possibly reluctantly, by the administration after unfortunate delays at a time when prompt action was needed.

In reviewing the work of the Department of Agriculture, it would be well to consider facts and figures that come from the Department itself. The House can reach its own conclusions on the basis of the evidence presented.

The present Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, first appeared before our subcommittee on February 25, 1953. In explaining why it was necessary to review President Truman's budget, memorandum No. 1320 from the Secretary of Agriculture was placed in the 1954 agricultural appropriations hearings on page 22. The following is a paragraph from that memorandum:

As public servants, we must recognize the duty and responsibility we have to serve the public efficiently and well. The people of this country have a right to expect that every one of us will give a full day's work for a day's pay. They have a right to expect that we will find more effective and economical ways of doing our job. In these times of unprecedented public debt and continued high Federal expenditures, the public rightfully expects us to put forth even greater effort to effect savings in Government operations and to reduce public expenses. Fulfillment of this responsibility will require the undivided loyalty and support of every agency head and employee in the Department. We must work as a team if we are to meet the problems that lie ahead and render the greatest possible service to the farmers of America, the entire agricultural industry, and to this great and good country we love so much.

When the same Secretary of Agriculture appeared before our subcommittee this year with his budget for the regular activities of the Department for the 1957 fiscal year, he asked for \$753,326,108. The Benson budget for the 1954 fiscal year was \$639 million—Losses of Commodity Credit Corporation require an additional appropriation of \$929,287,178.

In 1953, there were 63,928 employees in the Department of Agriculture and two assistant secretaries. The estimate for the 1957 fiscal year is 70,312 employees and 3 assistants.

On page 7 of the 1954 agricultural appropriations hearings, the Secretary said:

No problem that we have inherited has been more difficult than the decision on the support price for butter.

On March 8, 1956, when your subcommittee was considering the supplemental appropriation, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] asked the Under Secretary of Agriculture, True Morse, this question:

Let me raise this point: I have been led to believe by reading some dairy magazines and by talking with farmers—quite a responsible dairy farmer today—that the dairy situation is considerably better than it was 2 years ago or even a year ago. Does the picture you get and the knowledge you have indicate that the dairy farmer is slowly pulling out of the low level of the depressed area into a little more satisfactory outlook for prosperity than he was in 2 years ago?



The Under Secretary, Mr. Morse, replied:

Yes, sir. That varies by areas; but generally the dairy farmers have a much improved milk-feed ratio; in fact it has been more favorable than in any recent years and as a result we have had reports from many areas of definite improvement in the condition of dairy farmers.

Now, let us look at the record. In 1952, the dairy price support program cost the Federal Government \$169,800,000 for the marketing year ending March 31, 1953. For the marketing year ending March 31, 1956, it is estimated by the Department that the cost of the dairy products acquired by the Government under the price support program will be \$275,522,000.

For the week ending April 25, 1956, the Government bought 8,033,879 pounds of butter alone. From October 17, 1933, to June 30, 1954, the Government lost \$267,238,427 in its transactions on butter, cheese, and dried milk. From July 1, 1954, through January 31, 1956, the Government loss on butter, cheese, and dried milk totaled \$627,598,394. The House can decide if these facts and figures indicate that the dairy problem has been solved.

On page 25, of the 1955 agricultural appropriations hearings, my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] asked the Secretary:

When you took office the livestock industry particularly was not in good shape, was it?

The Secretary replied:

No indeed, it was not.

Let us look at the price today as reported by the Department of Agriculture in this year's hearings before your subcommittee. On January 15, 1953, the average price received by farmers for beef cattle was \$19.70 per hundred.

On April 15, 1956—this year—the average price received by farmers was \$15 per hundred.

On January 15, 1953, the average price received by farmers for hogs was \$17.80 per hundred.

On April 15, 1956—this year—the average price for hogs received by farmers was \$14.30 per hundred.

Of course, the Congress felt that Secretary Benson needed more help than we gave to his predecessor, Secretary Brannan. We proceeded to give him two additional assistant secretaries in accordance with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Let us look at the advice some of these people are giving the Secretary. On page 251, of the 1956 agricultural appropriations hearings, Dr. Butz, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, said:

With respect to this parity ratio that stood last month at 86, I believe, nobody can predict accurately what that is going to be in the next 12 months. My personal feeling is that this is now at a bottom and if it makes any material change in the next 12 months it should be on the side of a modest rise.

This statement was made on February 7, 1955.

As reported in the hearings this year, the parity index on April 15, 1956, stood at 82 and at no time during the past year has there been the modest rise above 86 that the Assistant Secretary predicted.

Throughout the land, the voice of the Secretary has been heard proclaiming that if it were not for the huge accumulation of surpluses accumulated during the period of high rigid price supports, farm income would be \$2 billion higher.

Many people have asked me how the Secretary of Agriculture arrived at this figure.

Your committee was unable to find out. I would urge Members of the House to read his explanation on page 1508 of this year's hearings. It is about as clear as a drunken sailor trying to spell with an ouija board at midnight during an eclipse of the moon.

The dilemma of the cost-price squeeze facing American farmers is apparent to all of us. We need only review the price relationships of some of our commodities as shown on page 1504 of this year's hearings. These are figures offered by the Department of Agriculture.

Commodities under mandatory price support of 90 percent of parity, show less decline in price during the past 4 years than do those left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

For example, on January 15, 1953, the average price received by farmers for cotton was 29.79 cents a pound.

On April 15, 1956, this price was 32.50 cents a pound.

Average price received for wheat on January 15, 1953, was \$2.10 a bushel.

On April 15, 1956, the average price was \$2.03 a bushel.

Average price received for corn on January 15, 1953, was \$1.48 a bushel.

On April 15, 1956, the average price of corn was \$1.32 a bushel. Now, let us look at the difference in prices of the nonbasic commodities:

Average price received for rye on January 15, 1953, was \$1.65 a bushel.

On April 15, 1956, the average price of rye was \$1.01 a bushel.

Average price received for oats on January 15, 1953, was 82.1 cents a bushel.

On April 15, 1956, the average price of oats was 62.3 cents per bushel.

Average price received for barley on January 15, 1953, was \$1.37 a bushel.

On April 15, 1956, the average price of barley was 94.9 cents a bushel.

Average price received for potatoes on January 15, 1953, was \$2.06 a bushel.

On April 15, 1956, the average price of potatoes was \$1.72 a bushel.

Average price received for butterfat on January 15, 1953, was 68.3 cents a pound.

On April 15, 1956, the average price of butterfat was 57.9 cents a pound.

Average price received for eggs on January 15, 1953, was 45.8 cents a dozen.

On April 15, 1956, the average price of eggs was 38.5 cents a dozen.

There is a barrage of propaganda on the accumulation of surpluses. Just what are our surpluses now compared with stocks when this administration took office? Let's look at the record again. I am sure that you will find the information on page 1409 of the hearings of interest. Page after page of testimony elicited by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], will confirm the point that much of this surplus is the result of the failure of the administration to offer these commodities on the world market at competitive prices.

One question often asked is how much these price-support programs cost the taxpayers. Pages 1294 and 1295 of last year's hearings, and pages 1824 and 1825 of this year's hearings show the costs of Commodity Credit Corporation price support operations.

Figures of the Department of Agriculture show that costs of price-support operations for the period October 17, 1933, through June 30, 1953, totaled \$1,110,136,889. This covers the 20-year period for which Democratic administrations were responsible.

Cost of price-support operations from June 30, 1953, through June 30, 1956, comes to \$2,035,615,222. This covers the 3 years for which Secretary Benson is responsible.

You will note that under Benson cost of price supports in 3 years has been nearly double the cost for 20 years of Democratic administration.

Last year I called your attention to the fact that Secretary Benson was a costly Secretary of Agriculture.

Since this is an election year, how much additional cost will there be for the taxpayers in the next fiscal year?

Another subject deserves mention here today. Two years ago my good friend and colleague from Minnesota, the Honorable H. CARL ANDERSEN, and I introduced a diverted acres or soil bank bill. In 1954, the Department of Agriculture was reluctant to give serious consideration to our proposal and recommended against passage of the bills.

In the opening months of this 84th Congress, we again introduced identical bills.

On February 8, 1955, the Secretary appeared before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. On page 257 of the hearings you will find Mr. ANDERSEN asking this question:

Let me ask, Mr. Secretary, relative to this proposal of Mr. MARSHALL and me, just what is your opinion of it?

The Secretary replied:

I don't know that I have studied it enough personally to express an opinion.

A few months later an adverse report was sent to the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture. In view of the recent statements of the Secretary and the President, this is a surprise, is it not?

But listen to this. The President and the administration now claim that the soil bank which incorporates the basic elements of our bill is the crash program they have always had in mind to solve the farm problem. Much to our surprise, it appeared in the President's state of the Union message, despite the written opposition of the Department of Agriculture only a few months earlier.

On Monday, April 30, 1956, more than 2 years after our bill had been introduced, the same Secretary of Agriculture appeared before our subcommittee and said:

As the President said, the long delay in getting this bill makes it too late for most farmers to participate on the soil bank on this year's crops.

I emphatically agree with the Secretary's statement.

After 2 years of indecision on the part of the administration and the Department of Agriculture this confession comes with some ill grace. But that is not all. On the same day—and it appears on page 1501 of this year's hearings—Secretary Benson said:

Mr. Chairman, I do not think I have made any exaggerated statements as to what it (the soil bank) will accomplish. I am hopeful it will be very helpful. Nobody knows what will be accomplished until we put it into operation and try it.

I indicated that we had thought at first we might be able to bring about a balance in our production and marketing without resorting to a program which would pay the farmers for keeping land idle. Following our very heavy production of 1955 and the failure of the control of production through acreage control we came to realize we had to have something more vigorous and more dramatic.

In all frankness, I ask you if you think the Secretary would have accepted such a "dramatic" proposal if it were not an election year?

Of course, Mr. Chairman, we still have the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act on our statute books. In the period before World War II when we were faced with agricultural surpluses, this was an effective program for shifting production. This law remained the law of the land and could have been used by the present Secretary of Agriculture to great advantage.

Instead, however, the Eisenhower administration attempted to cut the authorization for this program to \$140 million in 1954. This year, Mr. Benson is asking for \$250 million for advance authorization and the committee is recommending this amount to the House.

If the need for vigorous and dramatic action is now so apparent to the Secretary, it would seem that he would request enough to place the diverted acres plan in operation. I am sure that the Congress would have given earnest consideration to such a request. Indeed, we might have done so without the interest of the Secretary if there were assurance that the program would be efficiently administered for the welfare of farmers.

The following figures supplied this subcommittee by the Department of Agriculture and found on page 2041 of this year's hearings show the extent of the decline in participation in this program by farmers.

In my own State of Minnesota, 114,362 farmers participated in the program in 1952.

In 1954, only 53,799 farmers participated.

Nationwide, 2,525,913 farmers participated in 1952.

In 1954, this number dropped to 1,134,758 farmers.

Why has this program, which had the cooperation of the farmers, failed to accomplish this objective in recent years?

Under Democratic administration, farmers were encouraged to take an active part in the management and direction of their farm programs. Farmers exercised independent judgment in electing their neighbors as community and county committeemen to administer farm programs.

When Mr. Benson became Secretary of Agriculture, he apparently was reluctant

to let farmers run their own farm programs. Secretary Benson is an advocate of advisory committees. He apparently feels farmers should be content to advise.

On page 2044 of this year's hearings I am certain members will be interested in noting the changes outlined by Secretary Benson affecting local ASC committees.

Administration by advisory committees leaves farmers outside looking in. Their information comes second hand or not at all. Regulations become floundered in bureaucratic prose intelligible only to the author, if to him.

All of this in the name of economy. Once again, however, the facts show a different picture. In 1952, the total expense of operating county committees in Minnesota was \$2,123,539. By 1955, it had risen to \$4,640,157.

In Indiana it rose from \$1,050,397 in 1952 to \$2,871,298 in 1955.

In Iowa it rose from \$4,481,449 in 1952 to \$12,194,890 in 1955.

Across the Nation it rose from \$44,280,557 in 1952 to \$92,552,272 in 1955.

This committee has urged that the Department make a study of the spread between what the farmer receives for his products and what the consumer pays for such products. On page 767 of our hearings information from the Department shows that the farmer received 47 cents of the food dollar in 1952. This sank to 38 cents in December of 1955. In reviewing the hearings where we have noted the increase of personnel, storage costs, and salary increases, it might be well for the Department in making this study also to determine how much the Department itself has contributed to the profit of the middleman.

Page 1494 of this year's hearings shows the high income of the packers. Income was up as much as 749 percent over 1954. The packer profits were at an unprecedented high level. During this period the farmer was receiving less and less for his livestock.

I have only mentioned a few of the instances that a study of the Appropriations Committee hearings would reveal. Our newspapers and magazines are presently filled with news items expressing concern as to how the farmer will vote this fall. I am certain that a full and complete study of the hearings before the Agricultural Appropriations Committee would indicate a good reason for such concern.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, our committee, in its exhaustive hearings, conscious of the fact that the farmers are not fully sharing in the prosperity of the Nation, has sought to help them where we justifiably could in certain sections of the bill, which has been explained by previous speakers.

The bill before us carries an appropriation of \$783,061,708 for regular activities of the Department. It provides for loan authorizations for REA and Farmers Home Administration of \$359,300,000—both in title 1 of the bill.

Under title 2 it provides for administrative expenses for the Commodity Credit Corporation of \$31 million, together with an appropriation of \$929,-

287,178 to restore capital impairment of CCC; and \$271,163,682, most of which covers reimbursement to the CCC for funds advanced to finance programs authorized by the Congress to meet special emergency conditions.

These special activities and the amounts can be found on page 25 of the report. On page 18 of the report you will find explanation of the \$929,287,178 item of expense of Commodity Credit reimbursement.

To avoid repetition of previous speakers, I would discuss only a few provisions which may be of particular interest to some Members:

#### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

We allowed the full budget request of \$145,300,000 for REA, and in addition provided for a contingency fund of \$43,700,000 which can be drawn on by co-operatives if they need more money by justifying same before the Bureau of the Budget.

For the rural telephone program we approved the budget amount, and, in addition, provided for a contingency of \$50,500,000—which can also be drawn on by justifying such additional request before the Bureau of the Budget.

While the committee feels such contingency may not be needed, yet, inasmuch as such appropriation does not affect Treasury balances until such funds are actually required, we decided to increase the contingency funds, as indicated, in case an emergency made such funds necessary.

REA is, as always, doing a good job and the committee wants to give it full cooperation.

#### SOIL CONSERVATION

Because of the great importance to the farmers, and to the future of our national economy, here is one of the changes in the bill in which we sought to give the farmer a little help. In some other parts of the bill we reduced appropriations where we thought justified in doing so, and we have added a part of such reductions to soil conservation.

The budget asked for \$65,215,000 for fiscal year 1957, and we increased that amount \$2,285,000 to a total of \$67,500,000. The committee feels that more soil-conservation technicians will be necessary to meet the additional responsibilities, which will result from the new soil-bank program.

#### RESEARCH AND EXTENSION SERVICE

Now, briefly, I want to discuss two items in this bill: Research and Extension Service.

For agricultural research, the committee recommends a total of \$49,972,000—an increase of \$10,816,845 over the available funds for 1956.

Practically all publishers of farm journals, land-grant agricultural colleges of the Nation, the Farm Bureau, its county agents, and all farm organizations unanimously agree that the great forward strides in agriculture have been made possible largely through the work of the Agricultural Research and Extension Service.

Their work has made possible the tremendous increase in production, distribution, and marketing, which has helped to provide the highest standard of living in the world for our people.



Without the thousands of men and women, many of them the leading scientists of the world, in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture and with the State experiment stations and Extension Service, who constantly seek to improve and increase farm products, we would not have the abundance throughout our land, the surpluses we sell and give to other nations that are short of food—largely because they do not have the type of scientific research and Extension Service we have developed here in the United States.

Our scientists also do a tremendous job in protecting farm crops from the ravages of insects. They develop new farm products, and find new markets for the farmers' commodities. They find ways to help the farmer cut his cost of production, and find ways, by marketing research, to cut his cost of transportation and marketing.

These agricultural research scientists work in all phases of agriculture. For instance, breeding up of dairy herds for greater production; improving grades of cattle, hogs, livestock, and poultry, and the Extension Service assists the farmers by helping them apply the scientific knowledge gained by research, which brings to agriculture great and lasting benefits.

While the Congress helps the farmer with legislation to the best of its ability, yet, the best authorities agree that the Research and Extension Service has brought to the farmer far greater benefits than could the Congress.

They help the farmer to increase production. They protect the farmer's production by developing chemicals, and by other means, that help to protect the farmer's crops from the ravishes of insects. Even with this constant fight to protect them, we find the farmers sustain a loss of \$3 billion a year to their crops, livestock, forests, home and farm buildings. Millions of acres of our forests each year are sprayed from airplanes in the fight against insects.

On the other hand, were it not for the work the scientists are doing, the loss would run double or more that amount, and the insect pests, if left unrestrained, would ultimately almost destroy agriculture. This insect fight alone is a much greater problem than the average citizen can imagine.

We now spend a total of about \$12 million a year on plant pest control, insects and plant quarantine activities. We must keep up a continuous fight against the Japanese beetle, sweetpotato weevil, citrus black fly, the Mexican fruitfly, phony peach and peach mosaic, barberry eradication, pink bollworm, golden nematode, cyst nematode, white fringed beetle, hall scale, gypsy moth, grasshoppers, and many other insects.

#### HYBRID CORN

Back in 1909, research scientists of the United States Department of Agriculture, cooperating with various Department of Agriculture experiment stations, conceived the idea of plant-breeding and crossing, and building up a new variety of corn. They followed through on this work by plant cross-breeding, and developing, until 1933, when they produced hybrid corn.

During those years, they grew a stronger stalk, and developed a type of corn with the ears on the stock at almost even height. They developed a stronger shank, through cross-breeding, which fastens the ear to the stalk. When they announced the development of the Iowa hybrid 939 (in 1933, they had a corn that increased production 25 percent, and a corn with ears so uniform in height on the stalk, from the ground, that it was almost perfectly adapted to gathering with the least loss by the mechanized corn picker. This new method released a great deal of farm labor to industry, which was a saving to the farmer and a boost to industry.

#### RESEARCH SCIENTISTS—BRUCELLOSIS

When the research scientists began the fight against brucellosis, in 1930, 10 percent of the cattle were infected. Today the percentage of infection is down to 2½ percent, saving the farmers hundreds of millions of dollars.

The United States Department of Agriculture says that in the last 20 years losses from brucellosis have been cut from approximately \$100 million a year to \$50 million annually at this time. The Department estimates total losses in that time at about \$1,500 million to the livestock industry: The efforts toward its complete eradication being increased through the experiment stations, county agents of the Farm Bureau, and by all farm organizations nationwide.

Tremendous savings to the livestock industry; and to the economy of our country which are being made compared with the small amount that is being spent in this brucellosis campaign again proves the great benefit gained through Research and Extension Service.

#### SOYBEANS

Soybeans, which were first used as a minor forage crop, have been developed through the research scientists in agriculture into one of the largest and most profitable crops in the Nation.

Since 1935, our scientists by plant breeding have developed 16 new varieties of soybeans, all producing higher yields with greater resistance to plant disease. On an average, these new varieties yield 20 percent more oil and 10 percent more beans than the varieties they have replaced. Our acreage has expanded 600 percent, with 17 million acres of soybeans planted and harvested last year. Our production increased from 49 million bushels in 1935 to 371 million bushels last year.

Today soybeans provide 70 percent of all vegetable oils used in margarine, and 54 percent in all vegetable shortenings.

Research scientists have opened one market outlet for 211 million pounds of soybean oil, which is annually used in paints, varnishes, and other industrial products requiring drying oil.

Entirely new industrial products have been developed, including acids, and special resins. In the fields of plastics, printing, paper, tile, textile sizing and automobile tire cord sizing the market continues to expand.

Finding of new uses for this farm product, and new markets have created such a demand that with the largest

crop of soybeans ever produced in 1955, the demand has pushed up the price from \$2 a bushel at harvest time, to about \$3 and over at the present time.

Our exports in soybeans have increased tremendously to the countries of the Middle East and Europe.

#### RESEARCH IN LIVESTOCK

In 1935, we were getting 1,756 pounds of pork per sow. We are now getting 2,118 pounds of pork per sow.

In 1935, we were getting an average of 4,184 pounds of milk per dairy cow. We now are getting 5,512 pounds per cow.

In poultry in 1935, we were averaging 122 eggs per hen. We are now averaging 184 eggs per hen annually.

In 1935 we were producing 429 million broiler chickens. We produced in 1955 1,060,000,000 broilers. We used to have chicken on Sunday. Now it is chicken every day in all restaurants.

It's the same way with turkeys. In fact poultry has become a major part of our diet. The scientists have produced, by crossbreeding, and improving their feed ration, finer quality of fowl that will produce more pounds in a shorter time on less feed.

By research on proper feeding, the scientists have developed a chicken of increased weight in less time and on less feed. Hence the farmer makes more profit.

#### CCC SURPLUSES

We still have huge surpluses in the CCC, largely due to the fact higher yields for most crops were harvested in 1954, and again in 1955. And due to the fact that we carry over more than a billion bushels of old wheat last July 1 before the bumper 1955 crop came in.

We also had over 11 million bales of cotton on hand before the last big crop was harvested.

We had on hand more than enough wheat and cotton to supply a whole year's demand for both domestic consumption and exports, and the carryover is expected to be even a little larger this summer.

On February 29, CCC had \$8.9 billion invested in inventory and loans; approximately \$5.7 billion represented cost of inventory items—already taken over, and owned outright by CCC. The other \$3.2 billion was advanced on nonrecourse price-support loans.

On February 29, \$2.6 billion of CCC borrowing authority was tied up in net realized losses, not yet reimbursed receivables, under Public Law 480, other accounts receivable, storage facilities, and similar commitments. This, combined with the investment in price-support loans and inventories, brought the total of CCC borrowing power in use to \$11.5 billion.

Heavy loan operations, partly because of the big cotton, corn crop, will make necessary a further increase of the CCC borrowing power during this session.

#### SALES RESULTS

Surplus disposal of CCC products of about \$1 billion in fiscal 1953 have risen to \$1,400,000,000 in fiscal 1954, and to more than \$2,100,000,000 in 1955. Since last July, we have disposed of \$1.54 billion worth of commodities, bringing the overall total to over \$5.5 billion in the 3½-year period. It is estimated

that the disposal for the 1956 fiscal year will be increased to a total of \$2.6 billion.

## SALES PROCEEDS

I might add that sales have been stepped up to the point that from July 1, 1955, through March 1956 the Department of Agriculture has sold of commodities owned by the CCC on the competitive market—for dollars—in the amount of \$1,108,317,720.22.

## EXPORTS

Exports of all of our major United States commodity crops are presently at a high level. Total exports have increased by 16 percent in the past 2 years. In 1955, our agricultural exports stimulated by the special programs which are in effect were more than 60 percent higher than those of the immediate prewar period, 1936 to 1940. They were 22 percent above the average of the previous 30 years.

Sales proceeds, July 1955 through March 1956

## PROGRAM AND COMMODITY AND SALES PROCEEDS

## Price support program:

## Basic commodities:

Corn.....	\$144,142,421.64
Cotton, extra long staple.....	7,611,724.88
Cotton, upland.....	147,225,404.18
Peanuts, farmers' stock.....	2,931,865.02
Rice, milled.....	26,279,597.93
Rice, rough.....	25,899,330.36
Tobacco.....	24,652.58
Wheat.....	399,219,723.46
Wheat flour <sup>1</sup> .....	3,992,787.45
Total basic.....	757,327,507.50

## Designated nonbasic commodities:

## Milk and butterfat:

Butter.....	14,138,668.36
Butter oil.....	630,590.29
Cheese.....	10,840,128.25
Milk, dried.....	10,334,902.21
Milk, fluid.....	-----
Whey.....	627,262.03
Tung oil.....	4,329,036.03
Wool.....	16,364,749.35

Total nonbasic commodities..... 57,265,336.52

## Other nonbasic commodities:

Barley.....	61,650,995.20
Beans, dry edible.....	8,264,884.19
Cottonseed and products:	
Cotton linters.....	10,903,936.74
Cottonseed meal.....	3,374,630.53
Cottonseed oil, crude.....	4,351,974.89
Cottonseed oil, refined.....	35,545,546.30
Flaxseed.....	25,726,170.45
Grain sorghum.....	70,014,938.40
Linseed oil.....	8,520,232.87
Naval stores:	
Rosin.....	4,593,740.93
Turpentine.....	355,735.29
Oats.....	13,102,631.97
Rye.....	6,443,416.32
Seeds, hay and pasture.....	6,343,960.50
Seeds, winter cover crop.....	3,021,260.26
Soybeans.....	31,510,821.36

Total other nonbasic commodities..... 293,724,876.20

Total price-support program..... 1,108,317,720.22

<sup>1</sup> Acquired by exchange of price support wheat for disposition under Public Law 480, title II.

Mr. Chairman, I think, in fairness to the Department of Agriculture, which is so essential to the prosperity of the farmers, and to the economy of our country, that we should all who know the facts admit that Secretary Benson and other officials in the Department of Agriculture who are responsible for its administration inherited, when they came to office, an emergency situation that never before faced any Secretary of Agriculture or his Department.

In this I refer to the fact that controls were not put on when they should have been, in the latter part of the previous administration, which permitted two bumper crops of wheat, cotton, corn, and farm products generally throughout the Nation, which had to be bought by the Government and stored, consisting of over billions of dollars worth of farm commodities. This at a time when farm prices had been falling from 1948 to the advent of Secretary Benson's being called to administer the Department of Agriculture.

As a member of this committee, before which Secretary Benson and his principal assistants testified last year, and again this year, and from the information we receive from them, I feel anyone, after evaluating the situation with which he was faced, and the effort he and his assistants have made to reduce these surpluses will agree that he has done a remarkably fine job, and deserves now and, in my opinion, in the future the commendation of the people of the Nation.

He has from the beginning had the courage to follow sound policies, which would remove the cause of these surpluses, and he has refused to compromise by giving the farmers only a sedative, which would wear off shortly, and they would find they were in a worse position as the months rolled on.

The sound policies that he and the President have worked out, and to which they have steadfastly adhered, have stopped the downward trend of prices which are now pointing up for farm products. His insistence on trying to remove the cause that has been penalizing the farmers is only beginning to pay off for the dairy interests, the livestock interests, the poultry interests, and other interests that bring to the farmers over 60 percent of their income.

After spending about 2 months in sitting across the table from Secretary Benson and his principal assistants, in committee, last year, and about 2 months this year, I have been impressed with their absolute honesty, their tremendous interest in alleviating the conditions of the farmers, and it is my belief if they have the proper cooperation of the Congress in enacting the soil-bank program, the Secretary has contended for, that agriculture from the present time on will become more profitable.

I believe we are on the threshold of better days for agriculture, but I insist, and most of the successful farmers of the Nation realize, that we must reduce the mountains of surpluses that are overhanging the market and depressing the farmers' prices before the farmers can fully share in the prosperity of the country.

That is the Eisenhower-Benson farm program, and, in my judgment, it is the only program that will put the farmer in a position where he will not have to produce for the Government, and sell his products at 80 or 90 percent of parity. If we can reduce these surpluses, and bring production in line with the demand, then the farmer will get 100 percent parity in the market place, to which he is entitled, without having to come to the Government, asking for 80 or 90 percent of what he should have.

This farm question will never be settled, as it should be, until we bring the surpluses down nearer to domestic and export demands.

May I repeat, public sentiment in the near future will give to Secretary Benson the rich commendation he deserves.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Illinois since he has been a member of our subcommittee has been one of the leaders in dealing with the programs about which he has been speaking in this research and extension work. As the gentleman knows, he himself urged very strongly the appropriations for research in this bill. As the gentleman knows I doubted that the qualified scientists necessary to justify this additional \$10 million program in research in this particular field could be found at this time.

I wonder if the gentleman would not perhaps agree with me that in some way there should be emphasis placed upon the training of young people to qualify as scientists for working in this great field. I wonder if he would care to comment on this before he proceeds further. I would appreciate it.

Mr. VURSELL. I remember the position taken by the gentleman from Minnesota, and I think he took a rather sound position in raising this question; but I think part of the answer to the gentleman's question is simply that our committee has started to become more concerned with the programs that are being laid out and that we are recommending that there be a very careful selection of these programs. I am of the opinion that with the cooperation of the scientists, and they have always been very cooperative, that we can carry out this extended work probably without any additional help and expense to speak of. I think we can meet the problem through those methods and, of course, with emphasis on agriculture in this country we are and will continue to develop more competent people along that line.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I doubt whether there has been any one thing that has brought as much in direct returns to agriculture through the years as research. I recall 30 years back I worked in very close cooperation with one of the first county agents who came to my home county of Lincoln in Minnesota. When we look back over the years



we can see that one item alone, the development of hybrid seed corn, has meant an additional half billion dollars income each year to the farmers of America. The money invested in research has been well spent. I hope some means can be found to accentuate the speed of training technicians and scientists in our land-grant colleges throughout America for this great work.

Mr. VURSELL. I think that is a very good point.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I make one short statement further. We are all proud of the fact we have on our subcommittee a colleague from the State of Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], whose father was the first county agent in the State of Minnesota. That is a good many years ago, I believe around 1913?

Mr. MARSHALL. In 1912-1913.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. He commenced his service in one county in my congressional district, Traverse County.

Mr. MARSHALL. That is correct, Traverse County.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. This illustrates just how closely knit both sides of this subcommittee are with extension and research. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. I notice on page 6 of the report, with reference to the hearings on the bill, that numerous Members and other witnesses made what appears to be a good case for special research. It goes on further to say:

The committee has not dealt separately with each of these because the Department, within the large amounts provided in this bill for research, has ample authority and funds to meet these and other similar research problems.

Because of a statement that I made before the committee and due to my prime interest in a small research project which I believe only calls for an expenditure of \$25,000 that we feel would eliminate the surplus in our raisin program, I was wondering if that applied in this case?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to my colleague that this is the type of case we have in mind. I recall the testimony given before our committee. We did look on that with merit as we did other similar problems called to our attention. As big as the overall research activity of the Department is—there is over \$92 million for research in this bill—certainly there should be funds to meet research needs of this type. These projects similar to yours that frequently come before us should have the attention of the Department. They have the money and they have the authority.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman and I appreciate very much the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Appropriations Committee once again brings to the floor of the House for your approval the annual appropriation bill of the Department of Agriculture.

It has been a pleasure working with our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and the other members of this committee. We were ably assisted by our executive secretary, Ross P. Pope.

For fiscal year 1957 we recommend appropriations of \$783,061,708 for regular activities; \$359,300,000 for loan authorizations; \$929,287,178 for corporate expenses; \$271,163,682 for special activities, and \$6,356,000 for the Farm Credit Administration.

Today, Mr. Chairman, we are searching for a constructive answer to the farm problem. Agriculture is undergoing a cost price squeeze while other segments of our population are prospering. We discuss our surplus commodities and at the same time realize that several million American families lack adequate diets, and throughout the world hundreds of millions of people today fear starvation. A decline in agriculture threatens the lasting prosperity of all of our people. It is impossible to have a sound prosperity unless the American farmer and agriculture generally receive an equitable share of the national income. It is a well known fact that well over one-third of our entire population is dependent upon the American farmer.

I, for one, believe that our surplus commodities are a blessing and not a liability. We must dispose of our surplus commodities in an orderly manner keeping in mind the necessity of such commodities in case of war. A Nation as wealthy as ours should be able to afford a year's supply of commodities properly stored in proper places in case of such an emergency. We will need a large national agricultural productive capacity in case of war. We appropriate each year huge sums for essential materials which are stockpiled, and it is just as wise to have adequate food supplies on hand if we are faced in the future with an all-out nuclear war. We might be faced overnight in this country with starvation. We must keep in mind that we only have a 3 months' supply of corn, 13 months' supply of wheat, 13 months' supply of cotton, 7 months' supply of rice, 1 month's supply of butter, and so on down the list of our surplus commodities. We have on hand today no important crop which exceeds a 14 months' supply.

The net income for the American farmer for the calendar year 1955 amounted to \$10,710,000,000. Our decline in farm income became very severe in the year 1951, and since that time the net income of our farmer has dropped 35 percent, with 12 percent of same taking place during the year 1955. Farm production in 1955 was 12 percent greater than in 1947, but gross farm income was 9.4 percent below 1947 and net farm income was down 38 percent. Our national income from sources other than agriculture increased nearly 68 percent during this period of time. Our American farmer experienced a drop in parity

ratio from 115 percent in 1947 to 80 percent in January of 1956.

Our total exports of agricultural products from this country in the year 1955 amounted to \$3,143,000,000. Our farmer today produces enough food and fiber for 18 consumers, and this is twice as many as 30 years ago. Through research and ingenuity our output has been increased by improved power, machinery, seeds, fertilizers, and chemicals. One of our main troubles arises from the fact that means to increase production have grown much faster than ways to expand markets and increase utilization of the farm output.

The total farm mortgage debt of the United States has increased 86 percent in this country from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1955. In my own State of Kentucky we have a total increase of 113 percent in our farm mortgage debt during this period of time. This is a concrete example of the situation facing the American farmer today.

Mr. Chairman, for the fiscal year 1957 appropriations totaling some \$65,900,000,000 will be approved by the Congress of the United States, and only 4.8 percent of this amount is for agriculture. I say to you quite frankly that if 10 percent went for agriculture we would not be out of line.

#### SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Our Soil Conservation Service was established on April 27, 1935, and today we have some 2,700 local soil conservation districts covering about 90 percent of all the farms and ranch lands in this country. Approximately 1½ million farmers and ranchers are active district cooperators applying soil and water conservation practices on their land. This is an increase of about 200,000 per year. We heard testimony to the effect that additional technicians were needed in nearly all of the soil conservation districts, and found that 45 percent of the districts today have fewer technicians than at any time in the past. In the Second Congressional District of Kentucky we have 12,572 farm cooperators in soil conservation. Some 4 or 5 years ago we were seeking additional farm cooperators, and now we do not have enough personnel to furnish co-operators the necessary technical service on our farms. Soil conservation is one of the great assets of our present-day Government, and in Kentucky we believe in soil conservation. We have 122 soil conservation districts. We realize that erosion is taking a heavy toll, and that in some instances our soils are deteriorating faster than we are building them up. We have enough good land left in this country to keep us prosperous and well fed if we conserve and improve it. Our committee recommends an appropriation of \$67½ million for conservation operations, which is an increase of \$2,285,000 over the 1957 budget estimates, and \$4,557,255 over the 1956 appropriations; \$17½ million for watershed protection, which is \$1½ million over the 1957 budget estimates, and \$5,505,935 over the 1956 appropriations; \$12 million for flood prevention, which is \$1,300,000 over the 1957 budget estimates, and \$2 million over the 1956

appropriations. We have resisted every effort to curtail the soil conservation programs, and to assure adequate technical assistants we have increased the amounts requested for the Soil Conservation Service. We recommend a total of \$97,232,000 for Soil Conservation Service, which is an increase of \$5,085,000 over the Department's budget request, and \$12,295,190 over the 1956 appropriations. We sincerely believe that this figure should be approved, thereby placing our farmers in a position in this country to be able to continue to conserve soil and water resources.

#### SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

Our greatest asset is our schoolchildren and we all realize the importance of good school meals for both the health of the children and effective teaching programs. Over 10 million schoolchildren received their school lunches each day and this represents over one-third of all of our schoolchildren. The request made for the school-lunch program totaled \$83,236,000, and, after hearing numerous witnesses, including a great number of the Members of Congress, we believe that the total appropriation for our school-lunch program should call for the sum of \$100 million. This is an increase of \$16,764,000 over the 1957 budget estimates, and \$16,764,788 over the 1956 appropriations. We request approval of this item.

#### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

If the Hoover Commission report were adopted, and especially recommendation No. 36 of the report, REA would be destroyed. Recommendation No. 36 provides that the Rural Electrification Administration be recognized on a self-supporting basis, and that it secure its financing from private sources. When Ancher Nelsen, the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, appeared before our committee I inquired as to whether or not he believed the Hoover Commission report on REA should be adopted, and I am glad to inform you that the Administrator disapproved of the suggestions made in the Hoover report concerning the destruction of the REA. When Secretary Benson appeared before our committee the same questions were asked, and he, in turn, stated that he was against the adoption of recommendation No. 36. Today 91 percent of our farmers have electric service. Our Rural Electrification Administration is one of the greatest achievements of our present-day Government, and this fact is recognized by every member of our committee. We recommend a total of \$194,800,000 for loan authorizations for REA, with \$145,300,000 for electrification and \$49,500,000 for rural telephones.

#### FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

Farmers' Home Administration renders great service to a group of people who are unable to obtain the necessary financial assistance when in need. We recommend a total loan authorization for our Farmers' Home Administration of \$164,500,000. Approval of this amount will assure the little farmer financial assistance for the future.

CII—509

#### AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

We recommend an appropriation of \$49,972,000 for research with this amount being \$10,816,845 more than the 1956 appropriation. We further recommend \$22,594,000 for plant and animal and pest control, which is \$2,413,300 more than the 1956 appropriation. We recommend a total appropriation for Agricultural Research Service of \$131,069,708 for fiscal year 1957, with this amount being \$29,416,145 more than the 1956 appropriation.

#### EXTENSION SERVICE

Extension Service has been of great benefit to the American farmer and especially so in the State of Kentucky. Funds appropriated for our Extension Service are used to supplement funds appropriated by State, county, and local governments for the employment of county agents, home demonstration agents, 4-H Club agents, and State specialists who, in turn, bring into force the additional programs of the Department of Agriculture. The county agents in my district, and in my State, are well qualified, dedicated people, and have performed a great service. We are losing county agents in my section of Kentucky due to the fact that the salaries received are wholly inadequate to take care of present-day living costs. The county agent with the necessary education and experience to carry out his duties is certainly entitled to receive a better salary than he receives under the present salary scale as provided for in my State of Kentucky. I pointed this fact out to the Secretary of Agriculture when he appeared before our committee, and we were assured that although the Department of Agriculture was not responsible, under the law, for setting the salary scale for county agents, discussions would be held with the proper officials of our land-grant colleges concerning this matter. Our county agents must be well qualified from the standpoint of education and experience, and are entitled, in turn, to a salary commensurate with the duties that they perform. We recommend a total of \$53,265,000 for Extension Service, with this being an increase of \$5,145,000 over the 1956 appropriations.

#### GOVERNMENT-OWNED LANDS PRODUCING SURPLUS COMMODITIES

We are informed today that we have in cultivation some 350 million acres of land, and that this is 50 million acres too much for our present needs. During our hearings I requested the General Counsel for the Department of Agriculture to file as a part of his testimony a report showing the total number of acres of Government land which was today producing agricultural commodities. This report may be found on page 1260 of our hearings, and shows that the Federal Government owns 405 million acres of land in this country, which is 21.3 percent of the total land area. This report further shows that the Federal Government, through its different departments, in the year 1954 had under lease 245 million acres of land, which was being used for grazing, and that the Department of Defense had under lease 1,400,000 acres of Federal land under contract for farming purposes. It is almost im-

possible to ascertain what portion, if any, of the 245 million acres of grazing land is used for the purpose of producing commodities which are now in surplus. Land under lease from the Federal Government which was condemned or purchased for public work sites and for use by the different departments of Government which are under lease part time to original owners when the land may be used for cultivation of agricultural commodities is good practice, but, in my opinion, all land leased today by the Federal Government which is producing agricultural commodities now in surplus which does not fall in this category should be immediately withdrawn. If we have too much land in production certainly the Federal Government should not be in the business of producing agricultural commodities which are now in surplus.

#### AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM SERVICE

We recommend an appropriation of \$217,500,000 for Agricultural Conservation Program Service for fiscal 1957. This is an increase of \$3 million over the 1956 appropriations.

#### AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

Our committee recommends an appropriation of \$127,100,000 for Agricultural Marketing Service, with this being \$18,537,648 more than the 1956 appropriations, and \$16,083,000 more than the 1956 budget estimates. We all agree that the marketing activities of agriculture must be encouraged.

#### COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Our total investment in loans and inventories for basic commodities as of March 31, 1956, amount to \$7,841,180,000. The total investment in loans and inventories for corn amounts to \$1,910,615,000; cotton \$2,275,499,000; peanuts \$27,010,000; rice \$229,309,000; tobacco \$547,292,000, and wheat \$2,820,422,000. We recommend an administrative expense authorization for the Commodity Credit Corporation of \$31,000,000, together with an appropriation of \$929,287,178 for restoration of capital impairment.

Mr. Chairman, as you well know, tobacco is one of our important agricultural commodities. This bill contains sufficient funds for proper administration of the tobacco program.

We all realize that agriculture must prosper if the Nation is to prosper, and our American farmer has the right to demand a standard of living in keeping with the contribution he makes to the national economy.

Our committee recommend this bill to the Members of the House.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to my distinguished friend from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, when the time came to add a Democrat to our subcommittee at the beginning of this Congress, it was our good fortune to have Mr. NATCHER assigned to our group. He has been diligent in attending to his work, has rendered splendid service, and I think will be of inestimable value to our subcommittee in the years to come.



Mr. NATCHER. I thank my friend from Minnesota, and desire to say at this time that I consider my friend, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, as one of the able Members of this House, and a true friend of the farmer.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to my distinguished friend from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank my friend.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman has well stated that this problem of surpluses should be considered as a blessing rather than a curse. I think anybody who has had the good fortune or misfortune, whichever we may wish to term it, to go to the Near East, especially in the close vicinity of the Israeli border, and has been able to check into the manner in which about 350,000 human beings are living, in camps which are really indescribable, to say nothing of the additional 550,000 refugees who are being taken care of further inland, in Lebanon, Syria, and Jordan—when he sees all of those people with scarcely enough to keep body and soul together he will be set to thinking that we in America should consider ourselves blessed to have this superabundance of food. I think the gentleman would agree with me that conditions would be really bad in this country if the time ever comes when there is not sufficient food to feed our own people here in America.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank my friend for that fine statement and certainly agree with him.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I commend my friend from Kentucky on his very excellent statement on this bill.

I notice that the sum \$145,300,000, which is \$14,700,000 less than last year, was allocated for the rural electrification program, and that the amount for the rural telephone service is \$25,500,000 less than last year. I am sure the gentleman has inquired fully from representatives of these two services as to the adequacy of the funds and whether or not these representatives could use additional funds. Will the gentleman explain the reductions?

Mr. NATCHER. I will say to my distinguished friend from Tennessee that at the time these two items were presented to our subcommittee they were carefully considered and a great deal of time spent with the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration and all witnesses who appeared before our committee to ascertain whether or not the amounts under discussion were ample for the fiscal year 1957. I, like my friend from Tennessee, am very much interested in the Rural Electrification Administration, and state that the amounts set forth in the bill are ample for 1957.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. You were assured that these funds are adequate?

Mr. EVINS. You were assured that those funds were adequate?

Mr. NATCHER. The amounts in this bill are ample.

Mr. EVINS. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to my distinguished friend, the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee and all the members of the subcommittee of both parties for the action taken on the school lunch program. I understand there are \$100 million in the bill for that purpose for the next fiscal year.

Mr. NATCHER. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is \$16,764,000 more than the budget estimate; is that correct?

Mr. NATCHER. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. That makes not only me, but many other Members happy because this is one of the finest and one of the most meritorious programs that I know of. It is a highly constructive program. I want further to add that whenever I have appeared before the subcommittee, and I have done so on a number of occasions in connection with the school-lunch program, the members of the subcommittee have always been most gracious and most generous. I want to express my deep thanks to the chairman and all the members of the subcommittee not only for the hard work they have done on the entire bill, but particularly for the action taken on the school-lunch program.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank my friend, the majority leader. I will say quite frankly that, since I have been a Member of the Congress, our distinguished majority leader has always shown his interest in our school-lunch program and to agriculture generally. He, too, believes, Mr. Chairman, that our school-children are our greatest asset.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. I think I would be remiss at this point if I did not call attention to the fact that, in addition to the school-lunch funds which we have appropriated in this bill, there are also available to the Secretary funds for the surplus commodities. Last year, he turned back to the neighborhood of \$114 million which were unused, and this sum could be tapped and is available, or at least a good-sized portion of this sum is available for next year so that he can supplement the school-lunch program out of these funds for surplus commodities.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank my friend.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. WHITTEN. I wish to express my appreciation to the majority leader for his kind reference to me as chairman of the committee. I would like to say that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr.

McCORMACK] not only has evidenced his interest in the school-lunch program through the years, but there has never been a greater friend of American agriculture in the Congress. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has always given us of his time and of his efforts in behalf of agriculture, and I wish to express my appreciation to him at this time.

Mr. NATCHER. I certainly join with my chairman in that statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. Thank you very much for your kind remarks; may I say to my friend from Mississippi, they are unexpected but deeply appreciated. I might say, like my friends, the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Kentucky, as well as other Members on both sides of the aisle, no matter what section of the country we come from, we view these great problems which confront our country from the angle of the best interest of the country as a whole.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank my friend.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the ranking member of the committee on my side of the aisle for giving me this time. I am not a member of the committee but I did desire time to make one or two basic points.

I believe this committee in future years could render a great service to this Congress if they began thinking about the fundamental ways in which we are going to work out this agricultural problem ultimately. I have been a Member of this House for the sixth year. Each year that we come here, whether it has been my side of the aisle that has been in control, or the other side, we have merely tried to meet the agricultural problem through stop-gap measures. In other words, we have tried to legislate on something that occurred probably within the last 12 months. I think it is time for this committee to go to the problem of determining where we are going in agriculture and how we are going to meet the long-term problem in agriculture.

You say to me, "What have you got to suggest?" I have thought a lot about this, because I am as vitally affected as any member of this committee. It seems to me there are two things that have to be done. Preliminary to that, we want to be sure that agricultural income is not going to drop; that that is at least going to be retained.

One is to expand the sales which agriculture can make. Within this country we are somewhat limited. That is one reason why I, together with several others authorized Public Law 580, because I saw a chance to expand our markets abroad where we could get rid of this surplus.

That is one way of going at it.

In the second place, it seems to me we would have to have some reduction in supply itself. We cannot keep on producing surpluses beyond what we can use, especially within the basic crops that are supported; where we are paying, in effect, parity or a subsidy for the production of those particular products. That is the reason that you saw me on

this floor at least six times asking that the soil-bank plan be passed and implemented this year. It provided a method for reducing acreage without reducing the farmers' income.

I do not see how you are going to basically get at the farm problem except in those two ways. First, you have to sell more. Second, you have to reduce the supply without reducing the farmers' income. Within those two suggestions I do not know what this committee could offer.

I am not going to be critical of it, because this committee has blazed the trail along two paths to help the situation. In the first place, you have said to the Department of Agriculture, "You must tell us what your needed reserve is. You have said to the Department of Agriculture: "You must tell us what our critical supply is; what we must have on hand if we reach an emergency which is declared as the result of aggression or some world action which we and our allies might have to face." Then we will know what our surplus is over and above the critical supply that we have to have available 365 days in the year. That is one thing you have done.

In the second place, you have put pressure upon the Department in the last 2 years to sell these surpluses upon the world market at the going price. You have said to the Secretary of Agriculture, "You cannot keep these surpluses in this country and sell them above the world price and make it impossible for us to make a sale." I want to compliment the committee because of those 2 things you have done in the last 2 years.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. For the sake of emphasis let me point out 2 or 3 things that I am sure the gentleman is aware of, points he made also, and to say that in all the years we have been bringing these bills here the gentleman from Illinois has been most helpful to us in the discussions, taking our side on some of these matters where there was some controversy about it. But I want to point out that while our committee is greatly interested in these various programs and supports them, we have nothing to do with directing them. We handle appropriations for 1 fiscal year at a time. Other than having investigations and releasing the information, other than giving directives to similar information in the Department on actions which we took last year we cannot direct. We get information, of course, as to increased production, but when for instance we develop the facts on what happens to the spread in prices between the farmer and the consumer our hands are tied, for we cannot write new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say that we do devote a great deal of our attention to pointing out the long-range things that are essential.

Mr. SPRINGER. I understand the gentleman and I am willing to admit that a great deal of what he has said is true.

In the last 2 years several things you have done had an impact upon our markets and surpluses.

I have talked with officials in the Department a great deal. If there is one criticism that comes to my mind it is that they do not do enough long-range thinking or develop fundamental approaches. Without that how are you going to meet the agriculture problem? I come back again to the proposition that we are doing too much year-to-year thinking and providing stop-gap legislation, trying to do things that may be beneficial for the moment, going about things from year to year, whereas it should be on a 5- or a 10-year basis.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. I believe the gentleman will agree with me that the officials of the Department of Agriculture have done a tremendous amount of thinking about moving these surpluses not only into the foreign markets but into the domestic markets as well. I undertake to say that in my judgment holding to what they consider a sound policy that they have done a remarkable job, and I have figures here to show that only in the last 9 months they have moved out of the Commodity Credit Corporation considerably over a billion dollars worth of food products.

In addition to that we have representatives abroad doing research as to how to get rid of these commodities, because this committee has insisted that all of the attachés of the Department of Agriculture be put under the State Department. They are making their reports directly to the State Department. They are giving them the world situation and they are looking as good salesmen at the same time for opportunities to increase the sales of our products abroad. The result has been that within the past 2 years exports have gone up 16 percent and we are now beginning to regain our export market. In my judgment it presents a rosy picture as to getting rid of surpluses by increasing exports and in other ways that are being thought out by our committee and are receiving the kind cooperation of Secretary Benson and Mr. Butz and some of the ablest men in Government.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman for the statement he has made, but I still come back to the proposition that the people down in the Department are not giving enough thought to the long-range fundamental problems of agriculture. I do think that is one of our greatest needs.

The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. VURSELL, pointed out a minute ago the increased production of pork. There are great increases also in cattle and poultry. The same is true in the other basic commodities. In the next 5 or 10 years we are going to see additional substantial increases basically in production.

These are the basic problems we have to think about in agriculture, and that is all long-term thought.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make a brief statement and to propound an inquiry of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], chairman of the subcommittee.

The Committee on Agriculture has received reports from several States indicating that the spotted alfalfa aphid has spread over wide areas and has caused damage to alfalfa crops in several Western and Southwestern States ranging up to as much as 75 percent of the total crops. Losses have already been estimated in terms of tens of millions of dollars. The pest is spreading rapidly and will probably be found in all alfalfa producing States within a year or so. Control of the pest is very expensive.

A special subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture has conducted hearings on this matter. We were told by Dr. B. T. Shaw, administrator, Agricultural Research Service, that the Department knows of no way of either eliminating this aphid or preventing its spread. Dr. Shaw expressed the opinion that the Federal Government's participation in this problem should be limited to research looking toward the control of the pest and the breeding of resistant alfalfa strains. He advised that the budget contemplates \$28,000 for control, and \$45,000 for the development of resistant types. Dr. Shaw was of the opinion that this amount was ample, particularly in view of the fact that these items could be increased if need be by his authority to transfer use of funds within his operations.

Apparently some of the directors of State experiment stations feel that it would be unwise to transfer any funds from other operations. They feel that all items in the budget are needed for the purposes for which they were budgeted. Dr. Louis E. Hawkins, who is director of the Oklahoma Experiment Station and chairman of the legislative committee of all of the 53 State and Territorial Agricultural Experiment Stations, has expressed to me the opinion that more funds should probably be earmarked for the spotted aphid program.

In this connection I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi, chairman of the subcommittee, whether he feels that the Department will have ample authority and will have ample funds in this bill to meet the aphid problem?

Mr. WHITTEN. I may say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that this bill carries a total of \$49,972,000 for agricultural research services. The report points out what these projects are and we also point out that they have ample authority to transfer funds should the occasion arise and, having as many projects as they have, they can finish some projects each year. May I point out that in the budget of the Department itself they have \$78,000 listed for research work having to do with the aphid problem. So within the funds in the bill, within the authority they have to transfer and with the knowledge that they complete some projects each year, certainly this is one of the projects they have plenty of authority and money to meet.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.



Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, during the past 2 years the farmers of the Antelope Valley of California, which I have the honor to represent, have been hit with one of the worst blights in the history of hay farming.

Alfalfa, the major crop, has been attacked, and crop after crop has been practically wiped out by a rapidly spreading spotted aphid. Insecticides, very expensive insecticides, have been applied with only fair success, but at almost ruinous cost to the farmers.

I brought this tragedy to the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture last year, and immediately added funds were assigned for research for insecticides and research and development for substitute aphid-resistant varieties of hay.

Lahontan proved the best resistant variety, but seed takes time and several crops to raise in quantity.

I appealed for some sort of subsidy arrangement so the farmers could get their insecticides either free or at a reduced cost to save them from ruin. Unfortunately there was nothing in the law to permit it.

I, therefore, am very happy to hear from the chairman that at least part of the \$10 million increase for research and development can be applied to this spotted aphid problem, so important to the alfalfa farmers of California and the 21st District.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I requested this time to confirm my understanding of the situation in regard to the gypsy moth control. As the subcommittee well knows, that has been a very serious situation in New England, and particularly in Massachusetts, spreading, as I understand it, into parts of southeastern New York, northern New Jersey, and eastern Pennsylvania. As a result of a meeting between officials of the Department of Agriculture and of all interested States, including representatives of State agricultural and conservation departments, held there on March 5, my impression is, it was generally recognized that if the infestation is not controlled, it could cause very extensive damage to timber and recreational facilities and to fruit, shade, and ornamental trees everywhere east of the Mississippi River.

My understanding is that the bill as reported by the committee for fiscal 1957 represents an increase of \$1,750,000, or a total of \$2,295,000. I further understand that within a year or so a technique has been developed of using a spray, I think composed of DDT and oil, which completely eliminates the insect where the area is sprayed and that an excellent cooperative program has been established between the Department, the States, and the local governments, and also private individuals and organizations.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is correct. Furthermore, I want to say to the gentleman that I have appreciated the great interest which he has shown in trying to do something

constructive toward preventing this very destructive pest from going all the way westward to the Rocky Mountains. And, that is just what will happen unless we get this thing under control. Further, I want to assure the gentleman that I am positive, from the attitude of the Department of Agriculture, that if this particular sum of money is not sufficient, they will come in early next spring with a request for a supplemental to not only hold the gypsy moth in check but to push it back and ultimately eradicate it.

Mr. HESELTON. I want to express my appreciation of the work that the subcommittee has done as well as of the fine individual efforts of the gentleman from Minnesota. I know the subcommittee does understand the threat and is anxious to cooperate wherever that can be done effectively. I would appreciate it if the chairman of the subcommittee would be willing to comment on the matter.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee. While the Northeast has the most heavily infested area, I understand the District of Columbia, all of Kentucky and West Virginia, most of Tennessee, and large parts of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Missouri, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas now have clear areas but which are highly susceptible. I know the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has been deeply concerned and has demonstrated his determination that this threat must be controlled.

Mr. WHITTEN. I think the gentleman has fully covered it, and the gentleman is right concerning the amount of money placed in the bill. The committee recognized the importance of this problem when it placed the funds here. A technique has been developed, and they are highly hopeful that they can do it on a large scale. Up to this time they have not done so. But, I think the facts are as the gentleman has explained them.

Mr. HESELTON. It is my understanding from the subcommittee hearings that the method of spraying can only be conducted during the period April 15 to about June 15.

Mr. WHITTEN. That was the testimony of the Department; in other words, during the period that the larva is coming out, and we have to get at it in the inception.

Mr. HESELTON. And the committee had that definitely in mind in making his recommendation?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman. I am certain as to the subcommittee attitude. I am confident that Congress, the Department, State, and local officials and interested individuals and groups recognize the seriousness of this infestation and will continue to cooperate fully to eradicate it as soon as possible.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I under-

stand that a part of eastern Pennsylvania, as well as southeastern New York, including most of Long Island and northern New Jersey, are in an extremely dangerous and exposed position with reference to the spread of this pest.

Mr. FLOOD. I want to say to the gentleman and to the committee that in my district, in Luzerne County, in the mountains of Pennsylvania, we had serious trouble for many years with this infestation of the gypsy moth. For a number of years this committee and the Department were striving to halt this plague in that area, and it has been terminated and the situation cured. And, that is why I want to express my concern and the concern of the committee, since the gentleman's district is not too far from mine—right over the hill, so to speak—and we are alarmed again with this potential danger in the New Jersey area.

Mr. HESELTON. It is my understanding that if it is not controlled, past experience has shown that frequently a million-acre tract will be made worthless in a very short period of time. I believe the latest official estimate is that between 35 and 40 million acres are infested and I understand that from 8 to 9 million acres of this total developed during the increase of infestation in the last 2 years.

Mr. FLOOD. It is deadly in destruction. There is no question about that. It will devastate your trees.

Mr. HESELTON. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. They are encouraging as to what can be done but they are also a warning from experience of what might happen in any area susceptible to this pest.

At this point, under permission granted to me in the House, I include a letter to me from Mr. E. D. Burgess, Chief of the Plant Pest Control Branch of the United States Department of Agriculture, dated today, together with the enclosures to which Mr. Burgess refers.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE,  
PLANT PEST CONTROL BRANCH,  
Washington, D. C., May 14, 1956.

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HESELTON: This will serve to confirm the information Dr. Clarkson furnished you by telephone on Friday and our conversation of this morning in regard to the appropriation outlook for gypsy-moth control.

The gypsy moth is an introduced pest which generally infests extensive areas of New England and New York. It is a destructive defoliator of forest, shade, and fruit trees and ornamentals. During periods of severe outbreaks it is not uncommon for a million acres or more to be completely defoliated. Its further spread during the past 2 years to the South and West is a matter of grave concern to both forest and recreational interests, nurserymen, and conservationists.

The number of inquiries reaching the Department, both from Congress and various sources in the States resulted in the Agricultural Research Service inviting State commissioners of agriculture to a meeting in Washington, D. C., on March 5 for the purpose of getting a more complete picture of what State officials, both within and outside the infested area, were thinking in regard to the future of this work. There is attached

a résumé of the conclusions reached. (See attached résumé.)

Your question as to the Department's recommendation for additional funds to expand spray operations during the remainder of the fiscal year 1956 and for fiscal year 1957 is shown in the following table:

Funds available for fiscal year 1956	\$545,000
Amount of supplemental recommended for fiscal year 1956	1,500,000
Additional funds recommended for 1957	2,500,000
Total recommended for 1957	3,045,000

<sup>1</sup> Witnesses from outside the Department recommended that \$1,500,000 be provided to expand work during the current season.

The amount reported in the House bill for fiscal year 1957 represents an increase of \$1,750,000 for a total of \$2,295,000.

There are attached two tables showing by States the Federal and non-Federal expenditures for gypsy-moth control for the period 1948 to 1956, inclusive.

If there is additional information that we can furnish please let us know.

Very truly yours,

E. D. BURGESS,  
Chief of Branch.

#### RÉSUMÉ OF A MEETING HELD TO CONSIDER THE GYPSY-MOTH PROBLEM, ROOM 218-A, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 5, 1956

The meeting opened with 15 States represented. The chairman outlined the purpose, stressing the countrywide interest that has developed in the gypsy moth problem as indicated by the number of inquiries reaching the Department. There was need to consider with the States a source of action for the future, so as to derive the utmost in results from State and Federal expenditures. Such a meeting is in accordance with the policy on Federal-State relations in pest prevention and control activities jointly developed by representatives of the Department and the executive committee of the National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture.

A colored movie of the gypsy moth reviewed the life habits of the pest, the extent and type of damage that it has caused in New England, and the effectiveness of current control procedures. Some 8 or 10 colored slides were shown emphasizing particular phases of the program.

A prepared statement on survey procedures described the unprecedented spread of the pest since 1953, and the improvements that have been made in trapping methods in recent years.

Representatives from States having had long experience with the gypsy moth were invited to present their views on the subject. Representatives from States as yet free from infestation were called upon to express their views.

The enclosed situation statement was then offered for consideration by the group.

The discussion that followed led to general concurrence in the following:

1. The gypsy moth is capable of causing extensive damage to timber and recreational values throughout the area from the Mississippi Valley east.

2. There is little to be gained and much to be lost by merely extending the present Federal-State resources to cover the enlarged area.

3. The demonstrated efficiency of control procedures now in use and the damage that would accrue to additional States as they become infested justifies a much more vigorous program than is now in operation.

4. A carefully planned and executed education and public relations program must precede expanded spraying operations.

5. Because of the many factors that must be taken into account in planning and executing a program of this kind it was considered inadvisable to estimate a completion date.

6. It was agreed that the quarantine has been highly successful in preventing long-distance spread of the pest. To prevent local spread, however, regulations must be backed up with spraying operations aimed at putting out the small fires that may come to light along the periphery of the generally infested area.

7. Survey procedures have been refined to a point that the presence or absence of the gypsy moth in a given area may be determined with a high degree of effectiveness and at relatively low cost.

Experience in carrying out large-scale control operations in Massachusetts were reviewed in some detail. This included a discussion of the spray program on Cape Cod 4 years ago and work of a similar character that has been done elsewhere in the State since then.

Considering the cost of year-to-year control in States such as Massachusetts, Connecticut, and eastern New York and the losses accruing in spite of such control effort, it was considered both feasible and economically sound to take the necessary steps to prevent further spread. There was complete agreement on effectiveness of procedures now available.

The 3 alternatives outlined on page 4 of the situation statement were discussed at length. Alternative No. 1 was considered inadequate. A program aimed at preventing or retarding the spread of an insect such as the gypsy moth cannot remain static. Either ground is gained or lost. To confine infestation to the area the gypsy moth now occupies without the help of a natural barrier of some kind has proved to be expensive and not entirely adequate.

The States bordering the generally infested area and those in line of spread were generally in agreement that an all-out eradication program should be undertaken immediately. While in earlier years, materials and equipment offered less encouragement to undertake eradication of a widespread pest, the point was made that modern methods provide much better opportunity for eradication than have existed heretofore.

Much attention was devoted to the need for educational work and public relations in advance of an expanded spray program, particularly in suburban areas and under circumstances where pastures for livestock, home gardens, and lakes and streams stocked with fish may be involved.

States within the generally infested area questioned whether the participating agencies should be committed to an all-out eradication program at this point. After reviewing experiences in Massachusetts, both with respect to the effectiveness of the spraying that was done on Cape Cod, and the favorable attitude of the public toward such a program once benefits are fully recognized, representatives of States that do not have infestation as yet but are in the path of recent spread were unanimous in their support of an aggressive spray program directed toward eventual eradication of the pest.

The concluding remarks of a number of conferees emphasized the need for complete Federal-State cooperation in an undertaking of this kind—and a positive goal to shoot at. The goal identified as being the most realistic was to undertake immediately the elimination of known infestations in Michigan, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, and to spray a protective border in New York State, this year's work to be followed in 1957 and succeeding years with a further expansion of the program, looking to the eventual eradication of the pest. Representatives from Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and New Jersey each cited evidence of what can be done in the way of accomplishing permanent relief from the pest. The approach generally favored would permit year to year evaluation of the program as progress is made, first in reducing the area of extension of the moth, and finally in working toward complete eradication.

MARCH 25, 1956.

#### U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

##### Gypsy-moth control

##### FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS

	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	Estimated, 1956
Connecticut	\$71,900	\$79,900	\$70,226	\$64,374	\$76,426	\$78,170	\$88,570	\$63,700	\$61,300
Maine	23,300	23,600	22,851	21,500	17,984	41,460	21,827	21,500	18,700
Maryland <sup>1</sup>								8,000	5,900
Massachusetts	68,800	85,000	104,447	87,380	92,521	81,692	57,240	48,200	42,400
Michigan							3,020	15,200	13,600
New Hampshire	23,400	24,400	17,380	15,305	13,060	25,986	19,244	19,700	20,700
New Jersey	700	600	768	347	345	1,883	1,621	1,500	700
New York	126,300	140,300	145,013	171,731	187,994	128,567	182,292	258,000	234,700
Oklahoma <sup>1</sup>					14,446	23,572	10,970		
Pennsylvania	174,166	146,200	108,423	63,731	49,707	30,112	20,068	25,700	33,100
Rhode Island	9,114	9,400	8,500	7,278	5,712	6,495	6,925	4,600	3,200
Vermont	77,600	80,700	70,094	72,321	85,727	92,958	62,666	57,600	66,300
District of Columbia	28,584	27,158	21,845	23,854	41,026	26,799	27,980	32,900	44,600
Total	603,864	617,258	569,547	557,821	584,948	537,694	502,423	556,600	545,200

##### NON-FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS

	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956
Connecticut	\$36,420	\$48,721	\$54,800	\$57,240	\$94,877	\$57,960	\$42,000	\$255,000	\$290,000
Maine	20,000	29,300	29,500	47,000	33,500	62,400	60,650	41,600	43,100
Massachusetts	862,053	910,543	814,270	1,246,315	588,175	849,628	812,070	1,279,500	870,500
Michigan								73,440	57,000
New Hampshire	36,496	42,337	34,295	88,718	91,052	89,700	84,092	184,000	126,350
New Jersey	13,175	13,781	15,410	14,435	12,845	23,680	23,680	23,680	20,455
New York	200,000	224,000	218,000	312,972	354,854	359,930	364,107	196,550	290,775
Pennsylvania	170,000	199,788	121,598	124,140	116,943	65,000	117,000	119,000	120,000
Rhode Island	9,000	6,000	5,000	95,800	106,763	120,483	113,075	104,210	110,960
Vermont	2,848	3,326	3,000	6,239	12,955	15,550	12,510	25,500	24,910
Total	1,349,992	1,477,796	1,295,873	1,992,859	1,411,964	1,644,331	1,629,184	2,302,481	1,954,050

<sup>1</sup> Equipment center.



The map which the subcommittee received and accepted for its files in its hearings—page 1644—provides an excellent visual picture of the status of the gypsy moth infestation as of September 1, 1955, as well as an indication of the disastrous potential spread in the hardwood forests throughout the area ranging easterly from northeastern South Dakota from a line running south to central Texas.

Much very valuable additional evidence is contained in the subcommittee hearings, particularly from page 1641 to page 1659, inclusive.

In view of the constructive action recommended by the subcommittee and approved by the full committee, I think it might be helpful to the many able Federal, State, county, and local officials, as well as to private groups and individuals, who are seriously concerned with the threat this moth presents, to mention several additional points from that testimony, as follows:

First. The gypsy moth is a serious pest of forest, fruit and shade trees, and ornamentals. The caterpillars, or larvae, feed on foliage and often strip large areas of woodland. Defoliation retards tree growth and weakens the trees. Repeated defoliations may kill the trees. While the gypsy moth normally prefers hardwood trees, pine and other valuable trees are frequently attacked. Gypsy moths cause damage not only to trees on farms and forest but also to trees in recreational and residential areas.

Second. Normally the natural spread of the gypsy moth is relatively slow. The female cannot fly, but newly hatched larvae are often carried considerable distances by strong winds. Usually long-distance spread occurs as a result of egg masses being carried on articles in commerce such as timber and quarry products. Christmas trees, nursery stock, and the like. The recent hurricanes along the Atlantic seaboard have also been a contributing factor in the recent spread of the pest.

Third. Until recently, a cooperative Federal-State regulatory and control program had been successful in confining gypsy moth infestation to the New England area and a narrow strip in eastern New York. During the outbreak of 1953 and 1954 which was the most intense and widespread of any yet experienced in this country, the current program proved inadequate to hold infestation in check. Recent surveys have confirmed a light but scattered infestation over large areas to the south and west of the area heretofore described as generally infested. This development leaves no natural barrier which could be utilized in a future holding program. Natural spread to the west and south is likely to continue at an accelerated rate. The threat to the extensive hardwood forests of the eastern and central parts of the United States is great.

Fourth. Quarantine enforcement: A Federal quarantine has been effectively enforced for many years to prevent interstate spread from the infested area. Partially infested States have parallel State quarantines to protect their uninfested portions. These quarantines regulate movement of products that may

carry infestation and provide for treatment of infested materials so that they may move safely in commerce. Control work carried on in areas from which such products are shipped is an effective aid to quarantine enforcement.

Fifth. Adequacy of available procedures: In 1946 DDT in oil applied by aircraft as a mist spray was used for the first time with spectacular results. Since then control procedures have been further perfected and the per acre cost substantially reduced. DDT is applied when the insects are in the larval stage which permits a control season of about 60 days' duration. One properly applied treatment at the rate of 1 pound of DDT and at the overall cost of \$1 per acre will achieve eradication.

Sixth. Outlook: The gypsy moth now infests an estimated 35 to 40 million acres. The infestation is mostly in New England, however, it now extends to some 8½ million acres in southeastern New York and limited areas in 2 counties in Pennsylvania, and 2 in New Jersey where infestation was discovered following the widespread and destructive outbreak of 1953 and 1954. It is now generally accepted by forest conservationists and entomologists alike that there are no further natural barriers to fall back on as an aid in preventing spread to the west and south. Should the gypsy moth reach the southern Appalachians and the Ozarks, it may find conditions, both climate and forest type, more to its liking than it has in New England. It is estimated that the gypsy moth now infests about 2 percent of the area of the United States.

Seventh. State cooperation: On March 5, 1956, representatives of State departments of agriculture, plant boards, and conservation departments met with representatives of the Department to consider a future course of action. The size and scope of the problem was discussed and there was complete agreement on the following points:

Eighth. Method of financing: During the period 1948 through 1955 Federal support for all phases of this program approximated \$565,000 annually. The amount contributed by cooperating States, cities, towns and individuals during this same period increased from \$1,350,000 in 1948 to a maximum of about \$2,302,000 in fiscal year 1955. It is expected that in the aggregate the States will share in the overall cost of the expanded program on about a 50-50 basis. The extent of responsibility resting with individual States will be worked out in joint conferences, giving appropriate recognition to values at stake in relation to the size of the area needing treatment, and the immediate benefits to be realized in the way of protection to woodlands, parks, and recreational areas.

Ninth. Proposed plan: This budget amendment is proposed to continue the expanded program and to cooperate with the States where infestation occurs in carrying out control measures where necessary to prevent widespread damage to timber and recreational areas in the fiscal year 1957. It would provide for spraying approximately 2½ million additional acres. Contracts would be let to apply DDT spray by either aircraft

or mist blowers. Multimotored aircraft will normally treat 1,200 to 2,000 acres per hour of actual flying time. Contractors with necessary experience and equipment are available to do the job.

It is estimated that funds at this same level will be required for a period of 8 to 10 years to insure the initial treatment of all known infested areas, including scattered infestations in new areas totaling 8½ million acres. The program being undertaken contemplates the eventual eradication of the gypsy moth.

Tenth. A recent letter requested by Hon. JAMIE L. WHITTEN, chairman of the subcommittee, from Hon. Ervin L. Peterson, Assistant Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Washington 25, D. C., February 28, 1956.  
Hon. JAMIE L. WHITTEN,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHITTEN: This is in response to your request for a statement regarding the gypsy-moth program.

The larval form of the gypsy moth is a destructive defoliator of forest, shade, and fruit trees and of ornamentals. A pest introduced from abroad many years ago, it has been confined until recently to the New England States, a narrow strip of eastern New York, and sporadic infestations in New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Canada, and Michigan. The Federal program of quarantine and suppression has been designed primarily to assist the States in eradicating outlying infestations, and preventing long-distance spread of the pest through quarantine action. Federal expenditures for these purposes have approximated \$545,000 per year.

During the past two seasons, trapping and inspection surveys disclosed a very serious spread of this pest in southeastern New York with extensions into northern New Jersey and eastern Pennsylvania. Winter egg surveys in these States, which are now substantially completed, have confirmed the earlier indications of scattered infestations in new areas totaling 8½ million acres.

The Department has not recommended an increase in the appropriation for this work. Gypsy-moth control is a joint responsibility. For the work to be successful a substantial proportion of the planning and financing of additional work must be done by State and local agencies and interested organizations in areas where infestation exists.

You will recall that during the hearings we reviewed with the committee a statement of policy and procedures recently worked out by the Department and the States covering Federal-State relations in pest prevention and control activities. In furtherance of the procedures outlined in that statement, the Department is evaluating the gypsy-moth problem in collaboration with the States. The Agricultural Research Service has invited the heads of State departments of agriculture, plant boards, and conservation departments to a meeting to be held in Washington next Monday, March 5. All information available to the Department will be presented at that meeting for comparison and consideration with information presented by the States. The conclusions reached will help the Department in formulating and guiding its future program. We feel sure the meeting will also assist the States in formulating their programs.

We are attaching a map showing the areas of new infestation as indicated by last summer's trapping and tables showing Federal and non-Federal expenditures during the period 1948-56.

Sincerely yours,  
E. L. PETERSON,  
Assistant Secretary.

While emphasis has been placed upon an expanded spray program in the northeastern part of the country, a most significant statement as to the potential danger in other parts of the country was the following by Dr. W. L. Popham, Director, Crops Regulatory Programs of the Agricultural Research Service in the United States Department of Agriculture:

We think the valuations would be much greater. Of course, such a program would have the added advantage of protecting very extensive areas of hardwoods in the southern Appalachians and Central States and into the Ozarks. Some of the scientists, entomologists, and foresters who made a rather exhaustive study of this problem a few years ago at the request of the Council of State Governments concluded that there may be areas in the central part of the country and in the Ozarks more to the liking of the insect than New England, where it happened to be introduced. In other words, historically it has been more damaging in the open types of timber to be found in the southern Appalachians—or more particularly across southern Illinois, Missouri, and the Ozark region.

This should be considered in the light of a brief statement filed by the Department at the request of the chairman of the subcommittee:

#### LOSSES CAUSED BY GYPSY MOTH

Defoliation by the gypsy moth causes economic damage by retarding the growth of trees, or creating other conditions that impair land values, and may ultimately kill the trees. The amount of defoliation varies from year to year. White pines and other conifers usually die after a single stripping of the foliage.

Estimates based on a 20-year study of some 200 representative observation points in eastern New England put the standing timber value of hardwood trees killed in those areas at \$16 million. Further estimates for the remainder of the infested area during that period placed the loss at \$10 million. This was prior to the extension of the area of infestation to an additional 9 million acres in southeastern New York. No evaluation was placed on the accompanying mortality of young white pine trees, which has continued since the studies were made and is hard to estimate because the trees are usually killed before they obtain sufficient growth to have any more than potential value.

A significant effect of defoliation is the loss in increment of tree growth. Apparently the loss of growth in trees varies proportionately with the amount of defoliation—a tree defoliated 75 percent generally will put on only 25 percent or less of its annual normal growth. Estimates place the monetary loss of growth of trees from defoliation and consequent loss of lumber in the infested area at an average of \$1.5 million yearly.

The death of trees in woodland creates several problems. One is the opening of the forest stand, which affects the remaining growth so that the subsequently developing trees may be unsuitable or of inferior quality for timber. It also affects the good forest cover that helps to regulate streamflow and minimize floods. The loss or damage to trees in recreation areas has proved a major consideration on Cape Cod and elsewhere in New England. Severe outbreaks have brought a reduction in land values. Heavy infestations of the caterpillars can make a home or vacation property extremely unpleasant, and, of course, increase the hazard of spread of the pest by the traveling public.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to ask a question or two of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, mostly as a matter of clarification.

I notice the overall funds for the Soil Conservation Service have been increased to the extent of \$5 million. That is set out on page 5 of the committee report. Then over on page 9, as I read the report, \$2,285,000 of that \$5 million has been allocated for the soil-bank program. Is that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. No, that is not correct. The soil-bank program has not yet become law, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. AVERY. That is right.

Mr. WHITTEN. But in view of the large size of the soil bank or the large size of the program, if the Federal Government is to get real results from expenditures under the conservation part of it and under the other part of it, they must apply the best technical knowledge that they have. Now, we have the soil conservation district organization, which is short of employees and is hard taxed to carry on the present program. In addition to the short supply of technicians in the conservation districts now, we are going to have four new ones, and recognizing that those technicians will be the best sort of information to handle the other program, we have increased these funds available to the soil-conservation program under existing law. But the fact that this other program is in sight did enter into our recognition of the need to strengthen this service.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Kansas has discussed this question with me. He is very much interested in seeing that the Soil Conservation Service is supplied with ample technical help to do the job it has. Earlier today, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and I had a conference on the floor and agreed that it was not intended that this language on page 9 be interpreted as offsetting the language which the committee has in the report on page 5. It was the committee's intention to aid not only the new soil-conservation districts which have been formed but also to give additional necessary technical assistance to the districts now in operation.

Mr. AVERY. I should like to ask the gentleman this further question. I notice on page 5 of the report there is the language "to an increasing number of soil-conservation districts." That language would not preclude the use of this money for technical assistance to existing soil-conservation districts?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Certainly not. It is the intent of the subcommittee that this additional money be used to increase technical assistance in the Soil Conservation Service wherever they need it throughout the United States of America.

Mr. AVERY. If I may ask one further question of the gentleman from Minnesota. We all know that in some areas there is a very critical need for increased

technical assistance and in other areas of the country the need is not so great. Is there ample authority in the basic law for this increased amount of money to the districts to be used in areas where it is most needed or does it have to follow some established formula?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am sure that my subcommittee would agree with me in this statement, that the Soil Conservation Service has all the authority it needs administratively to do just what the gentleman wants to see done; that is to see that technical assistance be given where it is needed and can do the most good.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman. Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the subcommittee chairman, in view of the fact that there are no amendments of which we are cognizant, if he will not ask that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I notice in this bill there is a \$10 million item of appropriation for animal disease laboratory facilities. According to the report this is for an \$18 million research facility, animal disease laboratory, to be located at Beltsville, Md. It occurred to me that it might be much more appropriate to locate such a facility, which is going to study animal diseases, in an area where the animals are produced and where they are available.

I am vehemently opposed to the construction of a laboratory near the densely populated area of Washington, D. C. I see no necessity for it. I think this type of facility should be located in the Midwest, where the markets, the packing-houses, and the livestock facilities are located.

I believe that some investigation should be made of this proposal to see if it would not be more appropriate to locate it in the center of the livestock-producing area. They have other research facilities that I know of; 1 in Alabama, 1 in Denver, Colo., and 1 in Illinois. They have many land-grant colleges throughout the country with facilities which could be used in conjunction with the research laboratory.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARSHALL. I might say to the gentleman that I am sure the committee shares some of his concern over this item. There is no question that something needs to be done from the Federal standpoint to establish a laboratory because of the fact that the health of



the people working at these laboratories in Denver, Auburn, and in Washington has been impaired because of conditions at the facility. The committee is not at all satisfied that the laboratory as such should be in this thickly settled area, for a number of reasons. We are urging that the Department review that particular matter and come up with the best answer. The committee has not said that they shall not build it in Beltsville because we feel the committee should rely on the best advice of the people working on this. However, there is a great deal of concern on the part of the members of the committee about the placing of this laboratory at Beltsville, in a thickly settled area, away from the heavy animal population, and in a place where there is some danger to the public health of the citizens in this area.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I thank the gentleman. There seemed to be considerable question in my mind as to why they would locate such a facility in this densely populated area.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. The research that was done earlier was done in one of the departmental buildings here. Every objection that they had to using one of the departmental buildings could be applied to moving the project out to Beltsville. It was, therefore, our feeling as a committee that further study should be made of this location. We also feel that great economies could be brought about if it were put someplace else. After all, out at Beltsville we have all kinds of healthy animals and other research projects which would be endangered, in addition to human life. There is also the fact that you would be bringing 25 highly contagious diseases close to the District of Columbia.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. Chairman, I heartily favor the construction of such a research facility as I feel that this type of research is urgently needed. I do sincerely hope that the Department of Agriculture will reconsider the proposed site as it would be ill advised to locate this facility in the Beltsville area. This is a permanent institution with an estimated cost of \$18,915,000, and, therefore, it should be appropriately located.

The committee report has questioned the advisability of locating a facility of this type in an area where it could become a threat to the health of millions of people in the event of an attack by hostile forces. Nearly half of the animal diseases to be studied are transmissible to man. In the event of a hostile attack we would be endangering the inhabitants of the entire area. This, I believe, should be considered when the Department of Agriculture makes its determination as to where this facility should be located.

In the hearings, a representative of the Department of Agriculture stated that reinforced concrete was to be used in the construction of these facilities to protect them from bomb attacks. This appears to be entirely inadequate and

the only real solution to this problem would be to relocate this facility at some point removed from the highly populated area. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to offer an amendment to remove this appropriation, as I feel it is justified, but I sincerely hope that the Department of Agriculture will take appropriate action to locate this facility somewhere in the Midwest.

This also offers us a real opportunity to carry out the intent of decentralization of our Government. We have continued to build up the Washington area. Instead of locating facilities which could more logically be located in other sections of the country, it appears to me that this institution could serve its purpose much better if it were completely removed from the Washington area.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take these few minutes for the purpose of directing a couple of questions to the chairman, and also to thank the committee for its consideration of probably one of the most important, or two of the most important agricultural problems in Florida today. One has to do with the Mediterranean fruit-fly infestation which was recently found to exist in both Broward and the Miami-Dade County area and the other with regard to the activity of the Department of Agriculture concerning the spreading decline, a citrus disease which has meant much in the way of the destruction of many acres of citrus crops in the State of Florida. I want to thank the committee for the serious consideration which I know it gave to both of these all-important problems. But, I want to direct these questions to the committee in order to make certain that I fully understand the program for the future. It is my understanding that there was requested of the committee \$856,000 for the purpose of additional customs inspections, and I see on page 7 of the report where the committee has actually provided a new item of appropriation of \$500,000 which is less than that requested for the purpose of working out a program for the use of this additional money to be transferred to the Bureau of Customs to develop a program which will prevent passengers from embarking in foreign ports on carriers destined for the United States with dangerous articles and materials and for domestic inspections. I would like to ask this question, Mr. Chairman: Was it the opinion of the committee, and did it have testimony before it, as to whether this amount rather than the amount requested would be adequate to provide 100 percent inspection by customs in the future, it being my understanding that since 1953 there have only been spot checks and it being understood that this is one of the possible reasons and one of the possible sources of this fruitfly infestation in this area.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman that the language in our report on page 7 probably expresses it much better than I can here on the floor. But, primarily the point we make is this: We went through the customs announcements and things of that sort. We have been trying to have a thorough

check on everybody who lands in the United States. We did have that at one time, but then we got into this spot-checking business. Spot checks do not work. Neither is it sound to let all these things be taken aboard in foreign countries, particularly on planes and ships and then try to catch them after they get into our own country. But if you try to meet the problem by giving customs all the money it, in turn, says it will have to have in order to do this work for the Department of Agriculture, it turns out that that becomes completely out of line with what is sound. After going over this with all the witnesses, we think, and I think I reflect the views of all of us on the committee, that this amount would be enough to substantially meet the requirements of this inspection service, depending on the time element, if proper notice is given to the embarking passengers in foreign countries prior to taking off for the United States. In other words, there was evidence that if the passengers had notice before they took this contraband aboard, we would not have one-tenth the problem over here that we do. So this is now trying to reconcile what we really need for the time being, but at the same time we are telling them to review the whole thing and stop these things before leaving the foreign shores.

Mr. CRAMER. I appreciate the chairman's explanation and the fact that the committee has shown great awareness of this problem. But, is it true that \$500,000 that has been provided will be adequate to give 100 percent inspection at customs in the areas in the State of Florida where it has been shown there is a definite need?

Mr. WHITTEN. We feel that if they will get busy on this, you can have 100 percent inspection prior to working the matter out. It is our opinion that the figures submitted by customs, which is a transfer, or at least they were in my own opinion, were considerably higher than actually should be the case.

Mr. CRAMER. You feel that these funds are adequate to carry out the inspection?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do.

Mr. CRAMER. I want to thank the chairman and to say that as of last Friday, as a matter of fact, 100 percent inspection has been put into effect in the State of Florida. I have only one additional question which I want to ask the chairman with reference to the \$1,500,000 contingency fund for the control of the outbreak of insect plant disease on page 3 of the bill. As you know, that has been a very serious problem in Florida with regard to spreading decline. Is it the opinion of the committee with regard to that as well as this Mediterranean fruitfly problem that that contingency fund is adequate?

Mr. WHITTEN. Of course, I may say to my friend that when we agreed on this figure and on that sum, we recognized the problem that needed to be met, otherwise, we would not have gone along with it. In our judgment, we think it is sufficient to meet the problem of the Mediterranean fruitfly threat which has developed in recent weeks. The gentleman, perhaps, is aware that it came to

our attention after we had virtually gotten ready to mark up the bill. But we did reopen the hearings to hear testimony and I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that it is an emergency fund. We told them it was adequate to initiate the program and we are looking forward to their taking it up in detail in the other body.

Mr. CRAMER. Then it is my understanding that you do contemplate sometime during the remainder of this session that a supplemental request will be made or, in the alternative, a request made in the Senate to take care of this, which is recognized as an emergency problem in Florida.

Mr. WHITTEN. I recognize that will probably happen. I would not want to commit myself other than as I have here. This would initiate a program, pending the working out of the problem.

Mr. CRAMER. I want to thank the chairman of the committee for the recognition which the committee has given to these two important problems in Florida and in the future, when the supplemental request is brought in, I trust it will be given the same careful consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I would take the opportunity at this time to compliment the Department of Agriculture on its effective and prompt action in regard to the two threats that have faced the Florida citrus industry this year.

Spreading decline—burrowing nematode—is an imported disease that is seriously threatening the great groves of our State and, since its appearance in the past 2 years, considerable research and many control methods have been effected. In conjunction with the State of Florida the Department has worked diligently to search out infected areas and to control the spread of this disease.

One hundred and fifty thousand dollars was appropriated from contingency funds in fiscal 1956 to make surveys of the infection which at the present time disclose, as of the 14th of May, that 878 acres of grove have been treated, 260 acres are ready for treatment and some 2,017 are being prepared for treatment. Total infection is known to have spread to 7,000 acres of our groves. Department of Agriculture requests for fiscal 1957 now total nearly \$500,000 for further mapping and other steps planned to control spread of the disease and to prepare for elimination of certain areas and treatment of others. The State has fully participated in this program and has appropriated \$1,800,000 for the biennium ending July 1957.

The Department has acted with sincerity and dispatch in moving to our assistance in this problem. We have been assured of their continued support as needed.

The Mediterranean fruitfly has recently been discovered in an area reaching from Pompano Beach to Kendall on the east coast of Florida. Those people familiar with the destruction caused by this infestation many years ago know how costly and dangerous it can be. Millions of boxes of fruit and millions of dollars revenue loss was suffered by the State by the previous infestation.

The fly was first identified by scientists in the Department of Agriculture on May 19 this year. Immediate action was taken on the two phases of protection needed to prevent spread of the infection and further infestation. Inspectors were immediately transferred to the State with 3,500 traps to determine areas of infestation. Ten thousand traps will soon be ready throughout the State and additional inspectors have been transferred to the area. With the interest of the White House being expressed, additional funds in the amount of \$500,000 have been asked by the Department and approved today in the contingency funds to commence this work in the State. Additional supplemental appropriations requests will be made to meet the full need for fiscal 1957.

In the second phase of defense against further spread of this dangerous infestation the Department has set up \$500,000 for 100 percent inspection by the Customs Bureau which has already gone into effect. Hearings were held May 9 on inspection quarantine methods for fruit shipment and will be effective this week on publication.

I think that the cooperation and action of the Department of Agriculture and customs is worthy of high commendation and I take this opportunity in the discussion of their appropriation requests in 1957 to make these remarks and point out the sincere efforts in the past of this administration to serve in the field of agriculture in a manner that is beneficial and of high importance. Their response to the need of a particular situation in a specified instance in the State of Florida is demonstrative of the attitude of the Department and its officials at all times.

The Committee on Appropriations has certainly to be complimented on its full realization of the needs of Florida in this instance in approving administration requests.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] has expired.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the best ambassador of good will America has is former President Harry S. Truman. There is no person in the United States, in or out of public life, except possibly the President, who could visit other countries and attract and grip the imagination and interest of their people and in a manner favorable to our own country. For the world knows it was under the leadership of Harry S. Truman that communism was stopped in its efforts to dominate all of Europe, Asia, and Africa, and to bring all countries and peoples under the domination of the Kremlin.

In the national interest of the United States it is most unfortunate that the

present administration feels so bitter toward former President Truman that it did not recognize the great psychological value that his trip abroad offered to us, and did not ask former President Truman, in his present trip abroad, to take some kind of an official status so that the full benefits of his visit and reception could be utilized in our own best interests.

Former President and Mrs. Truman are going to visit a number of countries abroad on their present trip. The people of the countries they will visit, most, if not all, free from Communist domination because of the leadership of Harry S. Truman, will I am sure, show them their affection by giving the President and Mrs. Truman a wholesome and rousing reception.

While former President and Mrs. Truman are abroad on their first tour of Europe since the former President dropped his official duties as President, and while he is traveling in no official capacity, the peoples of the countries they will visit will remember his sterling leadership which brought hope and confidence to them and which brought to Harry S. Truman the title of "Courageous Harry."

Despite the fact the visit abroad is as individual citizens, former President Truman will keep uppermost in his mind the doing and saying of those things that will be for the best interest of our country and the free world.

With or without any official status, Harry S. Truman is the best ambassador of good will the United States has today. It is small leadership and petty minds that fail to recognize this fact.

In their trip abroad countless millions of Americans wish former President and Mrs. Truman a most happy and pleasant journey.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute to my colleague and the very able chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, Mr. WHITTEN, and the entire committee, for a job well done in bringing out this appropriation bill.

I feel that this entire bill is a good one, and I am especially pleased that the committee has seen fit to recommend increases for such vital programs as the lunchroom program, which has meant so much to so many people in every section of the country. With increasing attendance and a larger number of schools participating, funds have become wholly inadequate; to the Soil Conservation Service for additional technical assistance; the Agricultural Research Service; and the Extension Service. I am also pleased with their insistence upon competitive sales, together with many other provisions which will be helpful to our agriculture, at this time when farm income is lagging far behind other segments of our population.

Since it is admitted by all that the farmers of our country are in such serious trouble, I feel that this program will have the full support of every Member of the House.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to join in complimenting the distinguished chairman and the very able



members of his energetic committee who have labored so long and studiously to present this Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for fiscal 1957. This measure before us is obviously the result of the most studied effort on the part of the committee, after extensive hearings and the appearance of multitudinous witnesses, that could be exerted to provide for the full operation of the Department of Agriculture in the greatest public interest, while at the same time eliminating or reducing those items of expenditure which experience has demonstrated are of little or no value to the general welfare.

Among the great many important items provided for in this bill, there are two that have been of particular personal interest to me over the past several years. The committee has recognized the great importance of these items and very wisely insured their greater application and expansion.

The first one is the so-called school-lunch program for which I have earnestly advocated a substantial increase because I felt it was eminently justified. There is, I believe, no better investment this country can make than attempting to improve the health of our schoolchildren, the citizens of tomorrow. As we all realize, the number of students in our grade and high schools all over the country has been steadily increasing and is destined to continue so increasing for an undetermined number of years ahead. It is, then, practical as well as patriotic wisdom to reasonably guarantee that these guardians of tomorrow's national security receive during their school years the essential foundation of health that can come only from an adequate food intake during their most energetic days. The committee has seen fit to increase this item by over \$16.5 million and directed the Agriculture Department to take other steps also that would appear to adequately cover the situation for the present at least, and the committee deserves the highest praise for this wise action.

In recognition of another serious problem, the control and eradication of the gypsy moth threat, the committee has provided a total of \$2,295,200. It has long been authoritatively judged and warned that if the insidious infestation of this type of moth is not controlled, it would cause even greater damage than it already has to timber, recreational facilities, fruit crops, and ornamental trees. I understand that the increase in this year's bill of nearly \$2 million is to encourage the use of a new technique in application of a most effective spray composition which promises to completely eliminate this dangerous insect and that an excellent cooperative program has been established between the Agriculture Department, and the various States and local governments and also private individuals and organizations. Certainly, such a program is in the general interest by promoting conservation of our physical resources and the committee has again demonstrated their patriotic wisdom in taking cognizance of the situation.

Of course, there are a great many other important provisions of this measure af-

fecting the general welfare, such as soil conservation, agricultural marketing research and service, meat inspection to protect the general health, and so forth, all of which have been thoroughly explained by the floor managers of this bill and I do not intend to intrude unnecessarily upon the time of this House by repetitious recital. I very earnestly feel that the overall content of the measure has been conscientiously designed to economically promote our agricultural concerns in the greatest national interest, and I hope that the bill will be passed promptly and unanimously.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to pay tribute to the great wisdom of the committee in including in the agriculture appropriations bill for 1957 emergency funds to combat the menace of another disastrous outbreak of an unwelcome visitor to our shores, the Mediterranean fruitfly.

This destructive insect, which threatens particularly a citrus industry vital not only to the great State of Florida which I am privileged to represent, but will affect the economy of other States as well, first reappeared in the southern tip of Florida only a few short weeks ago.

Memories of a disastrous earlier invasion of the fruitfly still lingers in Florida, and the first warning of its reappearance was answered promptly and unanimously by the Florida delegation in this House and in the other body. After conferring with leaders of the citrus industry, with officials of the Florida Plant Board, we met with officials of the Agriculture Department to outline a recommended plan for control of the fruitfly.

Time was of the essence, for the fruitfly is such nature that immediate and urgent steps must be taken not just to wipe it out where ever it exists, but to isolate it promptly when it is found, thus preventing its spread.

I am happy to say that our efforts were not unrewarded. Officials of the Agriculture Department, recognizing as we did that the fruitfly knows no politics and has no partisanship in its destructive operations, leaped into the breach to begin the fight against this deadly menace.

And similarly, the subcommittee on this bill, under the leadership of the able gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], has recognized the need for action now to implement the plans of the Department to control the fruitfly.

The committee has recommended, and I urge this House to concur, that \$500,000 be added to the Department's contingency fund for emergency insect outbreaks, that another \$500,000 be appropriated for transfer to the Bureau of Customs for 100 percent inspection of baggage coming into Florida, and that \$110,300 be added for increased inspection at ports of entry.

For many years, members of the Florida delegation in Congress have recognized that the present system of spot inspection of baggage is not adequate to prevent the recurrence of the Mediterranean fruitfly, and guard against other unwelcome visitors. We do not believe the fruitfly would be with us now had there been 100 percent inspection.

But this is no time for looking backward to what might have been. We say that the subcommittee has been wise in its handling of the problem, and we are assured that the funds sought are sufficient not only for the immediate emergency work needed, but to initiate a total inspection program to avert further emergencies.

I also would like to commend the committee's action in providing adequate funds for assisting the State of Florida in its all-out fight against spreading decline of citrus, caused by a burrowing nematode which, in its long-range effects, appears to be capable of wreaking as much disaster as the fruitfly.

This, too, is a vital matter, and I am happy to be able to state here that it is not a responsibility which the State of Florida has sought to shove off on the shoulders of the Federal Government. The record will show that the State government is bearing two-thirds of the cost of the research and control programs needed.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to express gratification for the prompt action which the Congress has taken to meet an emergency situation in Florida which can have dire consequences for the entire Nation and particularly the southern one-third of the United States. I speak of the discovery of the Mediterranean fruitfly in Florida which was located in Miami but has now been found as far north as west Palm Beach, which is in my own congressional district. As soon as the first word of the discovery of the Mediterranean fruitfly in Florida was heard, the State of Florida went into action, as well as the Florida congressional delegation, which called upon the Department of Agriculture to lend all possible aid. I want to commend not only the State of Florida, but the Department of Agriculture as well, for the very fine cooperation that has been extended and is continuing to meet this problem.

Senator HOLLAND, who is a member of the Appropriations and Agriculture Committees of the Senate, joined by Senator SMATHERS, presented the problem to the necessary committees of the Senate and had the experts from Florida and the Department of Agriculture to explain the extent of the problem. Our own House Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, headed by its very able chairman, Hon. JAMIE L. WHITTEN, when contacted by the Florida House Members, was most sympathetic to our problem. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] took the unusual step of opening up his committee's hearings, which had already been concluded, to allow testimony to be presented to the committee so that the emergency situation could be dealt with effectively. I think this is one of the finest examples of showing how rapidly Congress can and does step forward to meet those situations which are in the national welfare. I want to commend the Appropriations Committee for expressing its concern about the discovery of the Mediterranean fruitfly in south Florida. The committee stated in its report:

The committee is concerned about the recent discovery of the Mediterranean fruitfly

in southern Florida. It feels that every necessary action must be taken immediately to control and eliminate this threat to the citrus industry of the country.

In the appropriation bill reported from the committee, and acted upon by the House, increases are given for \$500,000 for the contingency fund for emergency outbreaks of insects; \$500,000 to be transferred to the Bureau of Customs for increased baggage checks to prevent importation of dangerous insects; and \$110,300 for increased inspection at ports of entry.

As I stated at the beginning, the Mediterranean fruitfly has now been found in West Palm Beach, which is some 70 miles north of the first located infestation in Florida. This means that the problem is larger than first anticipated, and I feel that we will have to call upon the Congress for additional funds when the full extent of the infestation is known. Work is going ahead rapidly now to discover this information. I feel sure that the committee which has acted so promptly in initiating a program to combat the Mediterranean fruitfly, will give the same careful consideration to requests for supplemental appropriations so that this infestation may be completely controlled.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, complete devastation of our Nation's fruit and vegetable crops could become a reality if the Mediterranean fruitfly recently discovered in Florida is not completely eradicated immediately.

The fly is now infesting fruit and vegetable crops at numerous spots in both Dade and Broward Counties, Fla. It was first found April 18, in Miami Shores, Fla., near the Miami International Airport. Pest-control experts of the United States Department of Agriculture and others were immediately rushed to the area after it had been definitely ascertained that adult Mediterranean fruitflies were present.

I have high praise for those in the United States Department of Agriculture who went into action so quickly to identify this menace and to curb it. Check points were set up around the infested area, extensive surveying by trappings is continuing in order to determine the locale of the infestation. Steps for eradication have already begun. Undoubtedly, the Department's recognition of the dangers facing the entire United States and their prompt action will save the Nation's major crops and untold millions of dollars.

The Mediterranean fruitfly has defeated all but one attempt by man to eradicate it. It has won and stopped entirely fruit and vegetable growing in Spain, Italy, Algeria, South Africa, Egypt, Tasmania, France, Greece, Brazil, Madagascar, Hawaiian Islands, and in the Holy Land. Crops can only be grown there if each fruit or host is individually bagged.

Only in Florida has the pest been stopped. That was in 1929. The United States Department of Agriculture knew then, as it knows now, that the Mediterranean fly has a capability of spreading and wiping out the entire crop of fruit and vegetables grown in the United States. They know definitely that it

could infest all of the west coast area, the entire tier of Southern States, and while there is no definite proof as to how far north the fly could live and exist, nobody wants to find out. This last infestation of 1929 was brought under control and completely eradicated, but it took 5,000 men, 18 months, and \$7½ million, as well as the assistance of the National Guard. The pest was found in 20 Florida counties before eradication was completed.

The present infested area is in Dade County in an 18-square-mile area surrounding the Miami International Airport. The infestation has also been found in South Broward County, on Miami Beach, and the most recent at Kendall, Fla., which is 8 miles south of the International Airport and in the heart of the great fruit and vegetable district of Dade County. Indications are that new infestations will continue to be found as trapping activities are extended.

Reaction and response of the local people and governmental units have been prompt and willing. Growers and producers have voluntarily offered men and equipment. The county commissioners of Dade County made available immediately \$25,000 for State plant officials and for the United States Department of Agriculture to meet immediate payrolls. The State cabinet is making \$100,000 available immediately and will supply for the State's participation a million dollars, or whatever sum is necessary.

A State quarantine on Dade County was invoked, and a Federal quarantine followed.

Federal assistance and participation is needed and requested. Any quarantine and inspection, to be effective, must be under Federal control. This will require the assignment of many personnel during the entire emergency. In addition, in the national interest, the Federal Government has a vital part to play in the eradication and control programs.

The United States Department of Agriculture has prepared a budget request for funds to meet this emergency; and that the budget request is now being considered by the Bureau of the Budget.

I am sure that the entire committee appreciates and recognizes the seriousness of this problem. We can't emphasize too strongly that action must be prompt and that whatever money needs to be spent should be spent to completely eradicate this pest. It is very obvious that \$1 spent now will save hundreds of dollars later.

In behalf of the entire Florida delegation, I wish to express my appreciation to the chairman, JAMIE WHITTEN, and the members of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations who at my request extended to us the great courtesy of hearing this emergency matter and including it in the record and their report on the Agricultural Appropriation Act, although the regular public hearings of this subcommittee have been concluded for some time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House

with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11177) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, he reported the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

#### MILITARY PROGRAM AND APPROPRIATIONS IN MUTUAL SECURITY BILL

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the mutual security bill, now under consideration by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member, is a package affair that includes both military and nonmilitary programs. The military portion, consisting of tanks, guns, planes and other equipment, accounts for more than 60 percent of the funds requested in this bill, or approximately \$3 billion.

The nonmilitary part of the bill is a collection of programs that go under a variety of names such as defense support, development assistance, and technical cooperation. This year the Administration is asking Congress to vote \$1.9 billion for all of these, or slightly less than 40 percent of the new money requested.

The committee has been assured repeatedly that the military money in the mutual security program is not only for the defense of our allies but is for our own defense as well. Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told our committee last year that "the military aid program is part and parcel



of the United States Defense Department program. The expenditures abroad in support of our alliances do not differ in purpose, scope, or objective from our own military expenditures. The fact that this part of our program is not included in the Defense Department budget is more a matter of procedure and administration than of substance."

This year Admiral Radford testified that the mutual security program "is an essential part of the defense of the United States and of the free world. In planning military programs of the United States the existence and scope of the military assistance program is fully considered. There is no duplication. They supplement each other. Both are essential to our own national defense."

Mr. Gordon Gray, Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs, Department of Defense, made the point that "but for the military forces generated, stimulated, and assisted by our military assistance program, to attain the same measure of military security in the world our own forces would have to be larger."

Mr. Gray threw further light on the close relation between this program and our own defense program when he informed the committee that our allies "are getting more and more of the same equipment that we have actively in the hands of our own troops. Indeed, there are some items now in our programs which are being delivered simultaneously to Allied countries and to our own troops, where this is possible without impairing the combat effectiveness of our own troops."

I have attempted, as have other members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to ascertain the reasons for not including the military portions of the mutual security program in our defense appropriations since the expenditures of these funds are so vital to our own defense. The answers that have been given to date have not, in my opinion, been satisfactory.

We were told last year, and again this year, by witnesses from the executive branch that the separation of the two military programs was due to historical reasons. That is, of course, correct. But it does not explain the reasons for perpetuating the separation of these two programs that are now recognized as having a common objective—the defense of the United States.

Mr. Struve Hensel, Mr. Gray's predecessor, admitted last year that there was much to be said for putting the military money of the mutual security program in the Department of Defense budget. He added that he thought it could well be handled from the money angle in that budget. Mr. Gray testified this year that "the Defense Department could live under either structure" and noted that "nobody has initiated a change."

Some of us derived hope last year that a change would be made when Secretary Dulles testified. On the matter of moving the military part of the mutual security program into the Defense

Department's appropriation he stated that—

That aspect of the matter will be reviewed particularly in connection with the reorganization which is planned, at which time \* \* \* a number of the activities of the FOA which relate to direct military aid will be transferred to the Defense Department. \* \* \* I would think that the reorganization which is taking place would at least give rise to a reconsideration of that matter for the future.

The reorganization about which Secretary Dulles spoke has taken place. If the merger of the two military appropriations was considered, it must have been rejected because this year we are right back where we were last year.

In my own judgment, funds for the military program should be included in the budget of the Department of Defense. I have reason to believe there is substantial support for this point of view. Therefore, I shall ask the Committee on Foreign Affairs to include a section in its report on the mutual security bill strongly recommending that all military expenditures now included in the mutual security program be incorporated in the future in the budget of the Department of Defense.

Such an approach, if adopted by the administration, will distinguish clearly between military and nonmilitary aid and will give the Members of Congress an opportunity in the future to vote for or against a mutual security bill that contains purely nonmilitary items.

The legislative situation is such at this time in the present session that it is impossible to include the foreign aid military money in the defense appropriation. But as a step in that direction, and in an effort to overcome the bureaucratic inertia that seems to exist, I shall also ask the Committee on Foreign Affairs to consider the possibility of reporting this year 2 rather than 1 mutual security authorization bills—1 military and the other nonmilitary.

Whether this moderate proposal is acted upon favorably or rejected, it will serve notice on the administration that there is an increased interest in presenting foreign aid military money as part of our Defense Department appropriation.

If the executive branch offers a package foreign aid bill again next year, it should be prepared to justify it on grounds other than historical.

#### THE SOLUTION OF THE ENGINEERING PROBLEM

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Western World is in a new, grave kind of danger. The West has many times been threatened by military and political domination from the East. But never before has it faced the loss of its leadership in science and technology.

Today that leadership is in the greatest jeopardy.

In fact, it will certainly be lost unless we find new ways to meet the new and dangerous challenge coming from Russia.

Today's struggle is no mere military struggle limited to the fields of Europe or Asia Minor. This is a military, political, economic, and technological race between two giants of the entire world—the United States and Russia. The key to that race is supremacy in scientific and technological manpower.

As Dr. Joel Hildebrand, president of the American Chemical Society, said recently:

We are pitted against forces who have more land, more resources, more people than we have. If we let them go ahead of us in education, the national disaster for us and our way of life is inevitable. Our hopes lie in an enlightened people from whom we can obtain the essential leadership necessary to build the kind of world in which we all want to live.

And Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of America, put it this way:

American security and industrial strength—two goals which are completely intermeshed—are today dependent upon our success in overcoming present shortages and assuring an expanded reservoir of scientists, trained engineers and technicians. This hardly needs to be proved, it is so self-evident. There is no substitute for brains and practical skills in a technical age like ours. Automation, it is true, is advancing with giant steps. But every step, if it is not to turn into a stumble, demands additional contingents of qualified personnel.

It is extremely disturbing, therefore, to learn that Soviet Russia is already turning out engineers at a greater rate than we do. It comes as a shock to be told that if the present trends continue, the land of communism will, within a decade or sooner, outstrip the United States across the technological board. In the struggle between freedom and communism now under way, this is a situation that we cannot afford to view complacently.

We have not, of course, been viewing it complacently. Nearly every educator in the United States has spoken out about our falling behind the Soviet world in this most critical area of competition—the education and training of enough scientists, engineers and technicians.

We have had enough warnings. We have had enough speeches. But we have had little action.

Today I propose action. I propose a concrete Government program that will lick the problem.

I shall not review in detail the dismaying statistics that describe our predicament so graphically. The full picture can be found in the report by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy entitled "Engineering and Scientific Manpower in the United States, Western Europe and Russia."

But so that there need be no doubt as to the seriousness of this shortage of scientists and engineers, I shall just sketch some of the most important facts.

According to the Engineering Manpower Commission, the United States needed 35,000 new graduate scientists and engineers in 1955 to keep up defense work and to maintain our standard of living. We actually got 23,000—less than two-thirds of those needed.

With the advent of automation and other scientific advances, our needs will increase steadily. But there is little hope

of filling the gap—unless the kind of bold, constructive action I propose today is taken.

While American output of engineers lags, the Soviet Union has been expanding its output by leaps and bounds. The Russians are now graduating 10 times as many engineers as they did 25 short years ago. And with single-minded fanaticism they are continuing to expand. In 1954, they turned out 53,000 engineers and scientists. In 1955, the number is estimated at 63,000—nearly 3 times as many as were graduated here in the United States.

And they are not inferior engineers, either. According to former Senator William Benton, publisher of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Russian university training is far more rigorous than ours.

I am sure you all know of the desperate need for engineers in American industry, much of which is intimately involved in our national defense effort, in the development of jet planes, guided missiles, and earth satellites on which our very existence depends. I am sure you all read recently in *Life* magazine the elaborate recruiting setups large corporations maintain. These firms send their agents to college campuses all over the country, and almost always the number of firms bidding for students outnumber the students available. As a company official said as he watched 400 firms compete for graduates of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, if the graduates had been divided equally, each firm would have gotten seven-tenths of a man.

Other schools give similar reports:

At the University of Alabama, 475 firms bid for 1 class of undergraduates.

At the University of New Hampshire, 93 students were available for 500 jobs offered.

At the University of Delaware, 75 prospective graduates were mobbed by 500 firms seeking new employees.

One more anecdote, as reported in the *Pittsburgh Press* will suffice to show the cut throat competition which the engineering shortage has brought on:

"When a small engineering college permitted a 2-day recruiting period on its campus, agents from 175 firms showed up to compete for the school's 123 graduates. All graduates got jobs, and—get this—1 eager agent hired away from their firms 6 of the other agents."

Even if there were no Russia, this lack of engineers would be a serious bottleneck to the expansion of our economy. The Russian threat makes it crucial.

Why has America fallen into this situation? And what is to be done about it?

To get the best answers to these questions and the best guidance in drawing up my bill, I went to those responsible for the education of engineers—the deans of America's engineering schools.

I wrote to the dean of every accredited engineering school in the country. By means of a questionnaire, I asked for their explanation of the shortage and their suggestions for solving this problem that threatens America's national security and industrial strength.

I would like to read you each letter I received. Every one contains valuable

information every Congressman should have. But it would take hours.

I will be glad to furnish copies of the deans' letters and questionnaires to every Congressman who is interested in knowing what deans in his district are thinking.

The deans were unanimous in their grave concern over the engineering shortage. And they agreed on two main reasons for our failure to produce enough engineers.

First, we are wasting our precious manpower in failing to enable many bright high school students to continue to college. According to Government reports, only 53 percent of students with an I. Q. of over 120 reach college. And only 40 percent of them are able to graduate.

It is safe to assume that the great proportion of these intelligent youngsters do not go to college because they cannot afford to; and of those who do go, not enough go into engineering.

Thus we need to offer this vast, untapped reservoir of talent new incentives; first, to get them to college, and second, to get them into engineering.

My survey of deans found that the second big roadblock toward getting enough engineers is our shortage of qualified teachers of engineering at the college level, and of qualified mathematics and science teachers at the high school level.

And because of the much higher salaries industry can offer, many of the best teachers are being lured into industry every year.

As Dean E. J. Taylor, of the College of Applied Science, at Ohio University, put it:

Our best young men, who should be going into teaching or research, are accepting employment in industry due to the large wage differential. This is a grave situation, and anything that can be done to prevent the loss of trained teachers and also to encourage talented young men to enter the teaching profession, should be done.

Dean W. W. Haggerty, of the University of Delaware's Engineering School, says his faculty lost six members to industry last year because of higher salaries involved.

To replace them and to take account of increased enrollment, we were forced to hire new faculty members. All of these came from other schools or were recent graduates. In other words, we merely acted as a training ground for industry for the six men who left us. Since we anticipate that our faculty will nearly double in size in the next decade, this problem will become increasingly acute.

Dean Ben T. Bogard, of the Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, quoted an Iowa engineer as saying:

If something isn't done, industry will soon eat up its own seed corn.

Now what kind of incentives can we offer in order to get more engineering students and teachers?

In Russia, the police state compels its youth to enter careers the State deems best. It conscripts the minds of the young people as it conscripts their bodies. May God forbid that kind of regimentation ever holding sway in our country.

In America, our methods of increasing our supply of trained engineers must conform completely to our tradition of free choice, and the measure I submit today does so with meticulous care.

Many of the incentives we can offer are intangible. As General Sarnoff put it:

We must rekindle in our youth that sense of adventure in pushing forward the horizons of science, research and invention. They must be helped to feel the thrill of delving into the mysteries of chemistry and physics, of electronics, atomics and aerodynamics. They must be made conscious of wonderful scientific worlds to be explored, mapped and opened up for the good of all mankind.

Better teaching, especially in high schools—an integral part of the problem—can bring that reawakening about.

We must also give the engineer increased status in our society, and we must stop treating teachers like nursemaids and counselors at summer camps, and again lift them to the position of dignity and prestige their responsibilities deserve.

But the main incentives must be economic. Boyhood dreams of scientific adventures are vain unless the dreamer can afford to go to college. Improved status for the teacher is useless in aiding him to support a family.

The bill I propose today looks toward these essential economic incentives to attract our best talent to engineering and to teaching.

Although the need is immediate, it was the deans' consensus that this acute scarcity could not be remedied by a crash program. Only a long-range program, they feel, will do the job. Thus, this bill is designed not as an immediate, miraculous cure-all, but a plan that will, within a few years' time, return America to its preeminence in science and technology.

The question arises, why a Government program? We have had other suggestions toward solution of the problem. General Sarnoff suggests a program initiated by private industry to give engineers a year's leave of absence at full pay in order to let them teach in high schools. Bills now in Congress suggest tax credits for those contributing to educational institutions and for parents who make tuition payments for their children.

These are all valuable ideas, but it is evident that they do not offer more than a small part of the solution. It is apparent that private individuals and industry have not, cannot, and should not be expected to solve this problem. It is a national problem. What cannot be solved independently of Government, must be solved by Government, acting for the welfare and security of all the people. In this case, only the Federal Government has the resources and prestige required for adequate and effective action.

In broad terms, what will this bill accomplish?

First, it will meet our estimated future deficit of 13,000 new engineers a year.

Thirty scholarships will be offered to outstanding residents in each congressional district in the continental United States and in the Territories. This part



of the program will become a reality in 4 years, the time it takes to turn out the first class of engineers.

Second, it will help meet our shortage of secondary-school teachers. It will offer outstanding engineering graduates the economic and professional incentives to devote a 3-year period to secondary-school teaching immediately after graduation.

The professional incentive would be the promise of a 3-year graduate fellowship leading to an advanced degree in engineering.

The economic incentive—to be applied both during the 3-year teaching period and the 3-year graduate fellowship—would be a Government grant sufficient to keep the grantee's income up to that of young engineers in industry.

The number of graduates who would enter this 6-year program is, of course, impossible to predict, but it is reasonable to assume that 60 percent, or nearly 8,000 qualified engineers will be available from each year's class to enter the 3-year secondary-school-teaching stint.

After the program attains its height, it will furnish approximately 24,000 high-school science and mathematics teachers the Nation would otherwise be without.

Third, the program will be of immediate benefit to engineering schools and engineering teachers. In order to help the engineering schools hold their faculties, engineering teachers at schools participating in the program will receive supplemental salary grants raising their incomes to the level paid industrial engineers with equal qualifications.

Teachers will then be able to afford to continue in their chosen profession, and engineering colleges will no longer have to worry about raids on their faculties.

These benefits will accrue to engineering schools and faculties as soon as the program starts.

Fourth, and perhaps most important in the long run, the program will eventually provide a steady, increased supply of engineers with advanced degrees for both industry and teaching. The salary supplements will apply to these teachers, as well.

I shall not take the time of the House to spell out all the details of this bill, but I would like to mention some other features.

This bill is, in effect, an amendment to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, and administration of its program will be in the hands of the Foundation's Director, subject—as all the Foundation's activities are—to the decisions of the National Science Board.

But I should like to emphasize in that connection that a section of the bill specifically forbids any Federal direction, supervision, or control over the administration, personnel, or curriculum of any educational institution. This is not a bill to control the teaching of engineering in America. It is purely and simply an incentive bill, to encourage America's great engineering schools toward greater realization of their own goals, according to standards and policies which they themselves set out.

Let us take a student from his first examination to his graduate degree, and

note how carefully all control over him or the schools he attends or at which he teaches is avoided.

The Foundation will hold exams in each congressional district early in each year, beginning in 1957, for entrance into college the following fall. Outstanding secondary school seniors in each district will take the exams, and the top 30 will be chosen. They will receive scholarships to the schools they choose, but only on the basis that the school accepts the scholarship plan and the applicants who apply.

Thus, there is no pressure on student or school. Schools are free to accept or reject applicants on the same basis they do now, insofar as this bill is concerned.

In addition to exemption from tuition fees, each student will receive a living allowance of \$100 a month during the school year.

The school itself will receive not just the tuition fees for each student it accepts under this program, but the actual cost of training him. This provision should encourage schools to enlarge their facilities for training engineers. But they need not do so, if they choose not to.

If a student does satisfactory work, his scholarship will be continued until he receives his bachelor's degree.

Following his graduation, the student may apply for a graduate fellowship. Under this 6-year program, he is granted 3 years of schooling toward an advanced degree, provided he first spend 3 years teaching at a secondary school.

During the entire 6-year period, he will receive Government grants sufficient to maintain his income at a level equal to that afforded by private industry.

Again there is no compulsion about the school at which the graduate fellow must teach, or on any school to accept him.

But he need not apply for this graduate work. He is free to go into industry or out of engineering altogether. If he is held, it is purely by the incentives. I believe the incentives will hold him.

Again, he is free to go to any school that will accept him, without pressure on either party. All the student must do is keep up his grades, as he must do anyway. All the school must do is maintain its scholastic standing.

In a discussion of costs, it is essential to recognize that money appropriated for this bill will go to develop our most precious resources, manpower. It will be money spent to meet an imperative need. Nothing is too costly if it is essential.

For example, look at the billions we are spending on our military establishment, our foreign aid program, our farm program, and on other measures necessary to national welfare and security. In comparison, this program is a modest one.

The cost of the undergraduate phase of the program is estimated as follows:

\$3,000 a year per student for 13,000 students, or about \$40 million for each year's class. The teacher salary supplements are estimated at an additional \$23 million. Thus, the cost of the undergraduate phase would be \$63 million in the first year, rising to \$183 million for the fourth and succeeding years.

Until it is known how many graduate students will enter the advanced fellowship program, that cost cannot be estimated, but it is not expected that it will exceed by much the cost of the undergraduate program.

It is my opinion that this program will pay for itself, not in money flowing back into the Treasury, but in increased know-how for the Nation. The fruit of that increased know-how will be, not only improved national defense and technological superiority, though on that basis alone the expenditure is not only advisable, but essential.

But this program will also help win the war against want, the cause of all wars. It will help bring about more scientific miracles that banish disease and make life easier and more enjoyable.

That has been the payoff of American technological skill, not only for America, but the whole world—a better life, control over disease, and progress toward abundance for all.

If we act promptly to clear this roadblock, that American payoff to the world can continue. If we fail to act, we are likely to lose the big race with Russia, and with it our chance to do anything for anyone, including ourselves.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FRAZIER (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) for remainder of the week, on account of Committee on Un-American Activities hearings in Denver, Colo.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, for Wednesday and balance of week, on account of official business.

Mr. UTT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) for 1 week, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. EVINS, for 40 minutes on Wednesday next.

Mr. PATMAN, for 20 minutes on Wednesday next, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HESELTON, for 15 minutes on today and Tuesday.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. MARTIN).

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BETTS.

Mr. JENNINGS.

Mr. HESELTON, his remarks today on the Agriculture Department appropri-

tion bill and to include tabulations, correspondence, and minutes of a meeting.

Mr. VURSELL to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include a table.

Mr. VORYS and include a speech.

Mr. PELLY in two instances, in one to include a letter.

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and include a compilation prepared by the Library of Congress.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin.

Mr. JENSEN.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3732. An act to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 8547. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y."

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 15, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1846. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to improve the career opportunities of nurses and medical specialists of the Army, Navy, and Air Force"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1847. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the third of the reports required by section 708 (e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended by Public Law 295, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1848. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 104, title 4, United States Code"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1849. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Sfc. Thomas F. Callahan"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1850. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill relating to the procedure for altering certain bridges over navigable waters"; to the Committee on Public Works.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 10, 1956, the following bills were reported May 11, 1956:

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 11177. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CANNON: Committee of conference. H. R. 10004. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted May 14, 1956]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 9085. A bill to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to members of the civilian faculties of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School; without amendment (Rept. No. 2150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7992. A bill to enact certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 3489. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage; with amendment (Rept. No. 2152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 3315. An act to amend section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2153). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 3524. An act to give effect to the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries signed at Washington September 10, 1954, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 10368. A bill to amend the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, so as to require that certain reports and other communications of the executive branch to Congress contain information pertaining to the number of civilian officers and employees required to carry out additional or expanded functions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2156. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2157. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 3237. An act to provide for continuance of life insurance coverage under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended, in the case of employees receiving benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. House Joint Resolution 607. Joint resolution to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2159). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 10285. A bill to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for supervision of production credit associations; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 11040. A bill to advance the scientific and professional research and development programs of the Departments of Defense, the Interior, and Commerce, to improve the management and administration of certain departmental activities, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 10, 1956, the following bill was introduced on May 11, 1956:

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 11177. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

[Introduced and referred May 14, 1956]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY (by request):

H. R. 11178. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 11179. A bill relating to the north one-half of section 33, township 28 south, range 56 east, Copper River meridian, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 11180. A bill to provide that certain retired officers of the Army of the United States who were advanced in rank at the time of or after their retirement shall receive retired pay of the rank to which advanced; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 11181. A bill to authorize the coinage of standard 50-cent piece in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the city of Paducah, Ky., and in honor of the late Senator Alben W. Barkley; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 11182. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved May 1, 1906, as amended;



to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 11183. A bill to amend the act of June 22, 1936, relative to flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. R. 11184. A bill to amend paragraphs 1773 and 1774 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit free importation of certain religious articles by additional organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCINTIRE:

H. R. 11185. A bill to reorganize the Department of the Interior by establishing a Commercial Fisheries Division under an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior to exercise all functions having to do with the commercial fisheries, now carried on by branches of Fish and Wildlife Service of such Department; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 11186. A bill to authorize the construction of a shellfish research laboratory and experiment station in the Chesapeake Bay area; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 11187. A bill to repeal the act of September 25, 1950, relating to the Old Stone House in the District of Columbia, and to provide for the sale of such property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 11188. A bill to amend section 4 (a) (11) of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 so as to permit the issuance of visas to certain refugees residing in the Far East; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11189. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 so as to relax certain requirements for qualifying under such act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11190. A bill to amend section 20 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 so as to extend the time for the issuing of visas under such act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11191. A bill to amend section 5 (a) of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 so as to increase the number of visas authorized to be issued under such section, and to raise the age limitation of orphans entitled to such visas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11192. A bill to amend section 5 (a) of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, entitled "Orphans"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11193. A bill to increase the number of visas authorized to be issued to eligible orphans under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11194. A bill to extend the time during which visas may be issued under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11195. A bill to provide for the allocation of certain special nonquota immigrant visas which are authorized to be issued under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11196. A bill to amend sections 201 and 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 11197. A bill to provide for the retention in public ownership of certain lands around the Jim Woodruff Reservoir, Fla. and Ga., being administered by the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 11198. A bill relating to the retired pay of certain retired officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 11199. A bill relating to clerk hire of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H. R. 11200. A bill to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to encourage the training of additional engineers and the expansion of facilities for engineering education by providing supplementary salary grants for engineering teachers and scholarships and fellowships for engineering students; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 11201. A bill amending section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. J. Res. 622. Joint resolution to designate the dam and reservoir authorized to be constructed on the lower Cumberland River in Kentucky as Barkley Dam and Barkley Lake; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 238. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to conduct a study and inquiry with respect to severance of diplomatic, economic, and other relations between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred, as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to investigate and prosecute the violations of the civil rights of American citizens in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the enactment of certain clarifying amendments to the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, approved July 22, 1954, now under consideration by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 11202. A bill for the relief of Chu Leung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 11203. A bill to direct the issuance of patent to Thomas C. Haley of Sitka, Alaska, to certain land in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 11204. A bill for the relief of Ben Wilson Robison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 11205. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Roy Cowan and others arising by reason of the flooding of land in the vicinity of Lake Alice, N. Dak.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 11206. A bill for the relief of Han Hong Wang and An-Yin Chen Wang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. R. 11207. A bill for the relief of Cyrus B. Follmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 11208. A bill for the relief of Edward H. Turri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 11209. A bill for the relief of T. W. Wheeler, doing business as Winton Truck Lines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 11210. A bill for the relief of Maria Rodriguez Gomez Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 11211. A bill to provide for the advancement of Brig. Gen. Manus McCloskey, United States Army, retired, to the grade of major general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 11212. A bill for the relief of Alejo T. Tano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11213. A bill for the relief of Ignacio Martal Romano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11214. A bill for the relief of Marcos Sabulano Jampas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11215. A bill for the relief of Paulino Josue Elizalde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11216. A bill for the relief of Jose Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11217. A bill for the relief of Magtanol C. Polintan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11218. A bill for the relief of Modesto Erispe Tanoja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11219. A bill for the relief of Emilliano Jesmundo Magallanes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11220. A bill for the relief of Eriberto Chavez Abella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11221. A bill for the relief of Federico Tamayo Dagdagan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11222. A bill for the relief of Rodrigo Corope Alaura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11223. A bill for the relief of Marcial Mariano Yambio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11224. A bill for the relief of Carlos Odac Magahiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11225. A bill for the relief of Laudelino Tejada Avelino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11226. A bill for the relief of Gaudioso Trumata Macias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11227. A bill for the relief of Godofredo Matados de la Cruz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 11228. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ting Su; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11229. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Boyd Dinehart and Richard Reams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 11230. A bill for the relief of Valente Hernandez-Hernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 11231. A bill for the relief of Aram Peltekian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1019. By Mr. ASHMORE: Petitions of William R. Claytor, Jr., and 877 other residents of Slater, Greer, Taylors, Greenville, Simpsonville, Marietta, Piedmont, Pelzer, and Travelers Rest, S. C., urging enactment of

legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1020. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition of E. W. Oster and 89 other residents of Williston, N. Dak., and the surrounding territory urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1021. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Stanley Dominikoski and other residents of Morris Run and Tioga County, Pa., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1022. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of George Welch and 22 other residents of Waterloo, Iowa, and vicinity urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1023. By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of James L. Orr and 44 other residents of Pasadena, Calif., and vicinity, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1024. Also, petition of Guy M. Voorhees and 44 other residents of Burbank, Calif., and vicinity, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows

and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1025. Also, petition of Clark W. McIntyre and 41 other residents of Pasadena, Calif., and vicinity, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1026. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of Mrs. A. R. Nelson and eight other citizens of the State of Oregon urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1027. Also, petition of Charles Carson and 135 other citizens of the State of Oregon urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1028. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Herman Thomas and other citizens of Stone County, Mo., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1029. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. J. H. Woods and other citizens of Purdy, Mo., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1030. By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana: Petition of Mrs. N. J. Amy of Eunice, La., and 12 other residents of Eunice, Rayne, and Ville Platte, of the Seventh District of Louisiana, urging enactment of the Siler bill, H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1031. By Mr. VORYS: Petition of 45 residents of Ohio urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1032. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. G. J. Watumull, Watumull Foundation, Honolulu, T. H., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging a joint congressional investigation of the fluoridation of public drinking water, and the mortality statistics and high disease incidence in fluoridated areas like Grand Rapids, Mich., and Newburgh, Mass.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1033. Also, petition of Herbert L. Wiltsee, southern representative, the Council of State Governments, Chicago, Ill., relative to a resolution adopted April 28 by the southern regional conference of the Council of State Governments at Charleston, S. C., relating to "rules of construction to guide the Supreme Court"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1034. Also, petition of the executive secretary, the American Tariff League, Inc., New York, N. Y., transmitting additional petitions to those sent on May 4, bringing to 635 the number of companies and unions for which petitions have been signed relating to the subject of H. R. 5550; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. Edward J. Thyne, of Minnesota, Before Reserve Officers Association

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYNE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Monday, May 14, 1956

Mr. THYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered before the Reserve Officers Association at St. Paul, Minn., on May 5, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR EDWARD J. THYNE TO RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, STATE OF MINNESOTA, AT ST. PAUL, MINN., May 5, 1956

Never before in our history has the United States been required to invest so heavily in preparing for conflict at a time when its citizens are receiving and enjoying the dividends of peace. As a world leader, we are in the position of leading the forces for freedom and peace in the tense struggle against Russia and her satellites.

This type of position in world affairs presents many problems which we have not faced before. On the one hand, we must make every effort to establish friendly relations and a desire for peace by all nations and, at the same time, think in terms of a war which promises mass annihilation. We must investigate all possibilities for disarmament, but, at the same time, continue

our development of the most destructive weapons man has ever known. Within our own Nation, we must gradually build our Armed Forces into an effective and efficient fighting unit, but, at the same time, we must place a priority upon the factors which make up a peacetime economy and society.

We are, as a nation, in the position of a man working in the sunshine with the clouds of a summer storm in the background, threatening to interrupt his activity.

To maintain a proper balance between our search for peace and our preparation for a possible conflict demands the greatest skills of leadership available. In President Eisenhower, we have such leadership. He is particularly suited for leadership at this time because he, above all others, combines the type of statesmanship and diplomacy needed to build a foundation for peace, with the vast experience which he has in guiding the military destinies of the United States and the free world.

The many difficult problems which we have at the present day, however, demand the maximum efforts of all citizens in positions of responsibility. That is why I am pleased to have the opportunity to meet with the Minnesota State Reserve Officers Association. As a veteran of World War I, when I served as both an enlisted man and as an officer, and as your Senator, I understand your problems and recognize the importance of your program in supplying the type of leadership we need today.

Our main concern right now is to establish a proper balance between our manpower reserve and research into existing and new weapons within the budgets established by the administration and the Congress.

The greatest possible effort must be made in the development and research in the field of guided and interceptor missiles. We have already spent millions of dollars in missile research and development and will continue to make this program a priority in our

defense preparation. We also realize that the Russians are concentrating right now on missile development. It is no secret that the intercontinental missile, when fully developed, will have a deep impact on relations between the major world powers. At the same time, an interceptor missile which is capable of destroying a missile already in flight will further change the pattern of any future conflict.

At this point, I would like to make clear that I do not view a conflict of major powers as imminent. I believe that all nations are coming to the point where they realize the futility of war. However, we cannot operate on the assumption that peace is assured. We must protect ourselves against any possible outbreak of war. We learned very costly lessons at Pearl Harbor and in June 1950, when the Korean war started. Never again can we afford to be caught off balance.

I should also like to take issue with those who state that manpower is no longer important to our defense planning because the next war will be a pushbutton war and will be over in a short time. No matter what scientific advances we make in the development of new weapons, we will still need well-trained manpower in all branches of the service.

The Congress had this in mind when it passed the Reserve Forces Act of 1955. The passage of that act was a major step in the development of a strong and effective Reserve, which can be trained and schooled in methods of modern warfare.

In drafting this legislation, the Congress recognized certain facts which make the task of building a Reserve force difficult. We might as well admit from the outset that we are a peace-loving Nation and that during times of peace it is hard to generate enthusiasm for an active fighting force and for a large Reserve. This is a psychological hurdle which must be met.